

HEGEL'S "ANTHROPOLOGY"

Life, Psyche, and Second Nature



ALLEGRA DE LAURENTIIS

Hegel's *Anthropology*

Hegel's *Anthropology*

Life, Psyche, and Second Nature



Allegra de Laurentiis



NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY PRESS
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

Northwestern University Press
www.nupress.northwestern.edu

Copyright © 2021 by Northwestern University Press.
Published 2021. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: De Laurentiis, Allegra, author.

Title: Hegel's Anthropology : life, psyche, and second nature / Allegra de
Laurentiis.

Description: Evanston, Illinois : Northwestern University Press, 2021. |
Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021006090 | ISBN 9780810143760 (paperback) |
ISBN 9780810143777 (cloth) | ISBN 9780810143784 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 1770–1831. | Hegel,
Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 1770–1831. Philosophie des Geistes. | Spirit. |
Anthropology—Philosophy.

Classification: LCC B2949.S75 D4 2021 | DDC 193—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021006090>

To Jeff, Anna, and Alexander.
I know of no better anthropoi

CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations	<i>ix</i>
Preface	<i>xi</i>
Introduction	1
Spirit's Humble Beginnings	
1. On the Character of Hegel's Text	1
2. Text and Context	5
Chapter 1	11
Aristotelian Roots	
1. On "Unraveling the Sense" of <i>psuchē</i>	11
2. Hylomorphism	14
3. The Real Unity of the Cartesian Man	17
4. Return to the Roots: Being-Soul	23
Chapter 2	31
Life, or <i>die Weltseele</i>	
1. Nature Exceeds Itself	31
2. Goethe's <i>Urphänomen</i>	33
3. Hegel's <i>Urteil</i>	41
4. Natural Spirit	48
Chapter 3	59
False Enigmas and Real Beginnings	
1. Mind-Body Conundrums and the Meaning of Idealism	59
2. The Soul Begins as World-Soul (<i>kosmos zōon empsuchon</i>)	67
Chapter 4	73
Animal Life, or <i>das tierische Subjekt</i>	
1. The Strange Case of the Human Soul	73
2. One Genealogy, Many Races	78
3. From Enlightenment to Reaction: Johann Blumenbach to James Hunt	88

Chapter 5	99
No Longer Just Animal Life	
1. The Soul of Peoples	99
2. Kinship and the Individual: Disposition, Temperament, Character	104
3. Kinship and the Individual: Age, Sexuality, and the Patterns of Life	112
Chapter 6	
Premonitions of Selfhood, or <i>die ahnende Seele</i>	129
1. Organic Sensibility and Psyche's Sentience	129
2. From Sentience to Self-Feeling: A Matrix for the Ego	142
3. The Monadic Soul: On Dreaming, Fetal Life, and Hypnosis	146
Chapter 7	153
Disorders	
1. Healthy and Diseased Schisms of the Soul	153
2. Leading a Twofold Life: On Double <i>genii</i> and Bipolar Magnets	157
3. Out-of-Joint Times and Inner Derangement	165
Conclusion	177
Inhabiting the World, or <i>die Gewohnheit</i>	
1. Spirit Builds Itself a Home	177
2. On Divine Sparks, Unnatural Freedom, and Other Human Matters	182
Notes	193
Bibliography	215
Index	229

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used for Hegel's works throughout the text and notes:

<i>Aesth</i>	<i>Lectures on Aesthetics</i> [I–III]
<i>Enc</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Outline</i> (1830)
<i>GeschPh</i>	<i>Lectures on the History of Philosophy</i>
<i>GW</i>	<i>Gesammelte Werke</i>
<i>L Enc</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Part I, The Science of Logic</i> (1830)
<i>PhenG</i>	<i>Phenomenology of Spirit</i> (1807)
<i>PhGesch</i>	<i>Lectures on the Philosophy of History</i>
<i>PhN Enc</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Part II, The Philosophy of Nature</i> (1830)
<i>PhS Enc</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Part III, The Philosophy of Spirit</i> (1830)
<i>RPh</i>	<i>Outlines of the Philosophy of Right</i>
<i>W</i>	<i>Werke in zwanzig Bänden</i> [1–20]
<i>WdL</i>	<i>Science of Logic</i> (1812–32)

PREFACE

This study is about a hitherto neglected part of G. W. F. Hegel's mature system of philosophy, namely, the first part of the division entitled *Subjective Spirit* in the 1830 *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. This division entails an "anthropology" of spirit as soul, a "phenomenology" of spirit as consciousness, and a "psychology" of spirit in its theoretical and practical activities. The present study provides a detailed though inevitably selective treatment of the first of these three texts, the *Anthropology*. It aims to bring to attention the relevance and richness of Hegel's treatment of being-as-soul or "natural spirit" (which he sometimes refers to with the unusual expression *das Seelenhafte*); that is, of the psyche as the presupposition and ground of consciousness—the latter being the vastly more scrutinized form of spirit most readers first encounter in the 1807 *Phenomenology of Spirit* and then briefly again in the *Encyclopaedia* "Phenomenology," which follows the *Anthropology*.

A fresh reading of a long-overlooked text may offer a significant enrichment, and perhaps even a corrective to still prevalent readings that treat Hegel's early masterpiece, the 1807 *Phenomenology of Spirit*, as if it were the self-standing centerpiece of his oeuvre. While this work was indeed groundbreaking in the development of Hegel's thought, we also learn from the author himself that no rational account of reality—no *Realphilosophie*—can begin with, let alone be exhausted by, a study of the appearances of consciousness, and this means that such an account can neither begin nor end with a phenomenology of spirit. Rather, the philosophical account of the real must be grounded in a *prima philosophia* or *Science of Logic* that makes explicit the logical anatomy of actuality. This must then be corroborated (*bewahrheitet*), first, by a philosophy of nature capable of explaining nonliving as much as living nature; second, by an account of life's development of spiritual capacities and activities, including anthropic ones; third, by a philosophy of the self-objectifications of spirit in historical time; and lastly, by an explication of the principal ways in which spirit relates to its own actualizations—a philosophy of art, of religion, and of philosophy itself.

The account of life's development into spirit is the central concern of the *Anthropology*. In Hegel's perspective, the existence of spirit-as-soul is a prerequisite for the existence of more complex dimensions of spirit: self-consciousness, intellection, and will, as well as spirit's objective and absolute externalizations. It follows that our knowledge of the soul's

activities—sentience, feeling, and the tentative formation of selfhood—is both a necessary condition and integral part of our knowledge of spirit.

Beyond this overarching objective, the investigation offered here also aims at shedding light on less acknowledged aspects of Hegel's voracious interest in and encyclopedic acquaintance with medical and psychological theories and practices at the intersection of nature, history, and culture. The present study discusses, for example, some of the historical-scientific background of the *Anthropology's* explanations of circadian rhythms, fetal life, hypnotic or trance states, alleged capacities for premonition, degrees of mental derangement, and the subconscious mastery of bodily skill that enables higher and freer cultural activities. Hegel's treatments of these and germane topics have sometimes been dismissed as hopelessly naive and uninformed. Even more often, they have simply been ignored. This study offers a closer and, very often, sympathetic analysis of Hegel's claims and explanations. A nuanced reading reveals not only Hegel's profound and discerning knowledge of historical facts, legacies, and texts from antiquity to his present—he was perhaps the last of the *Universalgelehrten* or polymaths—but also his anticipations of later developments in psychology, his careful interpretations of both merely rumored and well-established mental occurrences, his concern with the inner coherence of scientific explanations, and finally his skepticism and occasional sarcasm about popular narratives and bogus sciences of psychic phenomena.

The principal subtopics of the *Anthropology*—nature's life forms, animal psyche, human subconscious life, psychosomatic states, psychiatric illness, and mastery of physical skill—have rarely been given detailed scholarly attention because they are not generally considered integral to Hegel's philosophical outlook. Even more rarely have they been treated with the systematic continuity in which Hegel explicates and justifies them here. Exceptions to this are the outstanding studies by Iring Fetscher 1970 and Murray Greene 1972, as well as the critical overview of the *Subjective Spirit* division provided by Dirk Stederoth 2001, and Richard Winfield's (2010) engagement of contemporary mind-theories from the perspective of Hegel's *Anthropology* and "Psychology." Part 1 of Terry Pinkard's 2012 work on Hegel's naturalism and the more recent monograph by Nicholas Mowad (2019), as well as a number of essay-length publications, among which Nuzzo (2103) stands out, all center on particular themes from the *Anthropology*—nature, corporeity, insanity, or the unconscious—whose intrinsic philosophical and not merely historical interest has been finding increasing recognition in this literature. However, despite introductory acknowledgments of the place of the *Anthropology* in the systematic philosophy of spirit, the thematic specificity of these studies tends to leave out the greater picture of Hegel's peculiar theory of the soul as the first result of nature's self-sublation into spirit. For too many readers, therefore, this treatise's in-depth and detailed accounts of matters pertaining to the presuppositions and primal forms of spirit retain the character of laborious, occasionally entertaining detours through the antiquated landscapes of

an obsolete-sounding theory of the psyche—with the Additions to the main texts often being viewed like showcases of an early nineteenth-century European cabinet of curiosities.

Instead, Hegel's text is approached here as one would approach any philosophical classic, namely, in systematic and (when needed) philological perspective, as well as in continuous dialogue with the history of philosophy to which Hegel is responding and of which he intends his systematic work to be the all-encompassing conclusion. Rather than forcing Hegel to live up to contemporary expectations and interests, the reader is invited here to think along with the philosopher; that is, to appreciate (to the extent possible) and to learn from the breadth and depth of the claims made, the explicit arguments that sustain them, the implied, sometimes conspicuously missing justifications, and the emphases and blind spots of this treatise as an integral part of the last of philosophic systems in the Western canon.

Beyond the intrinsic philosophical interest of the *Anthropology*, an attentive reading of it demonstrates that Hegel's early and never abandoned program, namely, to demonstrate that and how "substance becomes subject," can only be fully understood by acknowledging the metaphysical dimensions of his conception of actuality (*Wirklichkeit*). What we encounter in the *Anthropology* is an abnormally limited, inadequate form of spirit called *die Seele*. Its character is defined in contrast to the opulent forms of full-fledged spirit: the conscious cognition, voluntary agency, moral judgment, historical self-actualizations, and artistic, religious and philosophical activities of the political animal. To these is dedicated the greater part of the *Philosophy of Spirit*. And yet, despite the narrow scope of the soul's simple capacities, its basic self-objectifications, and its rather primitive movements, acquaintance with the soul's humble beginnings turns out to be indispensable for a thorough grasp of spirit. Generations of Hegel students have approached his daunting system of philosophy as if it started, as Hegel himself quips—probably with regard to Fichte's "I"—with a notion of absolute knowing as if it were shot "from the pistol" (*PhenG* W 3:31). But Hegel's explication of spirit is far less abstract and doctrinaire than this. Self-reflective thinking, including the philosophical kind, by itself undermines all attempts—and they are many, including contemporary neurosciences and philosophical naturalisms—to be reduced to its necessary physiological conditions. As shown along the path broken by Aristotle in *De anima* (henceforth cited as *Da*) long before Hegel's *Anthropology* amplified it into a modern road, the extraordinary nature of the mind capable of thinking all things, itself included, can only be disclosed by previous familiarity with the lowly root of self-consciousness: the hylomorphic soul.

The investigation offered here, while not disputing the dated and scientifically indefensible character of a few of Hegel's empirical claims, aims to show, first, the metaphysical dimension of the concept of *Geist*; second, the enduring relevance of Hegel's explication of the phenomenon philosophers now prefer to call "psyche" or "mind"; and third, the crucial role of

understanding *Seele* for a full grasp of *Geist*. The aim is, in other words, to make better known Hegel's full treatment of the many modes of existence of the soul, and to convey their systematic importance for an understanding of his philosophical account of spirit.



Without exception, the interpretations that follow are based on the original text found in Hegel's *Gesammelte Werke*. All translations are mine, based on a comparison of the text of GW with the relevant English translations: A. V. Miller's *Hegel's Philosophy of Nature* and *Hegel's Philosophy of Mind* (1971); the revision of the latter by Michael Inwood in *G.W.F. Hegel: Philosophy of Mind* (2007); and most notably Michael Jon Petry's *Hegel's Philosophy of Nature* (1970) and *Hegel's Philosophy of Subjective Spirit* (1978). Despite the indispensable nature of Petry's critical editions, in a few but not irrelevant cases these translations are terminologically obsolete and potentially misleading: some of these are discussed in my chapter notes. The state-of-the-art translation and commentary of the *Phenomenology of Spirit* by Michael Inwood (2018) could only be consulted in the latest stages of preparation of this manuscript. Still, it will no doubt become the definitive translation and critical edition of this complex and puzzling work for generations of Anglophone scholars and students to come.

Since the *Gesammelte Werke* include the Remarks (*Anmerkungen*, abbr. Anm) from Hegel's hand, but not the Additions (*Zusätze*, abbr. Zus) transcribed by his students, the text of the *Anthropology* is cited from the edition in *Werke in zwanzig Bänden*, which contains both the Remarks and Additions. The 1830 *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Outline*, which comprises the "lesser" *Science of Logic*, the *Philosophy of Nature*, and the *Philosophy of Spirit*, is contained in volumes 8, 9, and 10, respectively, of the *Werke in zwanzig Bänden*. The self-standing, "greater" *Science of Logic* of 1812–32 is contained in its volumes 5 and 6. Since in this book the *Anthropology* (§§388–412 of the *Encyclopaedia*) is referenced and quoted far more frequently than any other work, my citations of it omit an abbreviation of the title as well as the volume number. They are simply given as *Enc* followed by the § number and Zus or Anm, when applicable. Designations for the relatively rare citations of other works like the 1807 *Phenomenology of Spirit*, the 1820 *Philosophy of Right*, and the lectures on the *History of Philosophy*, the *Philosophy of History*, and *Aesthetics* are given in the "List of Abbreviations" earlier in this book.



The Introduction aims at clarifying the status of Hegel's *Anthropology* as a philosophical theory of the becoming of the anthropic soul, a theory whose

subject matter includes but goes beyond themes we would today assign to physical and to cultural anthropology. The Introduction gives a brief outline of the ways in which phenomena explained by key concepts in the *Anthropology* rely on categories and their logical relations found in the greater and lesser *Science of Logic*. Acknowledging the *Anthropology's* reliance on the *Logic* is important for three reasons. First is the intrinsic philosophical interest of Hegel's systematic way of describing natural and spiritual realities, which he considers altogether under the guise of processes or "movements" of actualization of logical relations. The second reason is that whether or not one is willing to embrace this highly controversial first criterion, the abstract logical categories and relations Hegel calls upon in the text on the soul turn out to be useful in the clarification of otherwise hopelessly murky natural-spiritual, or psychological, realities. Last but not least, in a scholarly context which for too long has denied the central role played by metaphysics, and hence by the *Science of Logic*, in Hegel's system, highlighting the logical categories that subtend this particular, "anthropological" part of the philosophy of reality contributes to making explicit the metaphysical foundations of Hegel's thought as a whole. The Introduction also sketches in an anticipatory manner other subject matters that Hegel expands on in the course of his treatise. It points to some of the main historical and scientific sources on which his philosophy of the psyche relies, sources that find a more detailed treatment in the relevant chapters of this study; and the case is made for the relevance of Hegel's analysis and explanation of particular phenomena to contemporary anthropological, psychological, and psychiatric knowledge. Finally, the Introduction also offers a succinct explanation of the systematic place of the *Anthropology* in the *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences* (a placement that by itself is a clue to the soul's hylomorphic nature), and provides a sketch of the composition and publication history of the *Encyclopaedia* as a whole.

Chapter 1, "Aristotelian Roots," discusses Hegel's contention that the unrivaled work on the meaning of "soul" in the history of Western philosophy is Aristotle's *De anima*. The chapter corroborates the almost intimate connection between the two thinkers—thus defending the plausibility of Hegel's own claims about this affinity—through textual, conceptual, and terminological comparisons between *De anima* and the *Anthropology*. This comparison naturally leads to a reading of Hegel's brand of hylomorphism as a version of Aristotle's entelechism. The pervasive hylomorphism of Hegel's conceptions of animality and human individuality is illustrated through a brief reconstruction of his reading of Descartes, of whom Hegel claims that, far from exemplifying dualism, he marks philosophy's "return" to the original "unity of man." The plausibility of a hylomorphic ontology of the phenomenon we commonly refer to as psyche, mind, or soul is supported by an examination of the abstract logical formula of the "identity of identity and difference," followed by a discussion of its distinctive meaning in the context of the identity-relation of soul and living body.

Chapter 2, “Life, or *die Weltseele*,” begins by emphasizing the centrality of organicism as the key concept in the study of nonmechanical systems in early nineteenth-century philosophy. This is followed by an explication of the biological and logical meanings of original division (*Ur-teilung*) and judgment (*Ur-teil*) in Hegel’s thought. The aim of this discussion is to explain in what sense and to what extent the idea of a naturally self-differentiating unity is basic to Hegel’s account of the soul. Hegel’s perspective is further clarified by comparison and contrast with the organicism found in the morphological studies and philosophical reflections on science found in Goethe’s *Aphorisms*. The chapter then turns to a close analysis of the first section of the *Anthropology* (§388), where Hegel employs the concept of an internally differentiated identity in order to argue that spirit’s emergence from nature is necessitated by “the Idea,” which implies that spirit’s emergence is logically necessary. This conception turns out to be pervasive in Hegel’s philosophy of reality: the notion of immanent differentiation, as opposed to external difference, plays a fundamental role in his explanations of movement, of material forces, of living corporeity, of natural development and, of course, of the soul. This chapter highlights as well Hegel’s indebtedness in this regard to contemporaneous scientists like Xavier Bichat and Johann F. Blumenbach.

Chapter 3, “False Enigmas and Real Beginnings,” resumes the exposition of Hegel’s rebuttal of so-called mind-body interactionism. Hegel’s hylomorphism is traced back to his reading of Plato’s *Parmenides*, where the hypothesis of the mutual exclusivity of Oneness and Multiplicity (“the One” and “the Many,” which Hegel associates with philosophical conceptions of spirit and matter, respectively) is proven to be hollow. Based on the oral commentaries appended to the initial sections of the *Anthropology* (the Additions transcribed by Hegel’s students), this chapter further examines Hegel’s interpretation of historical understandings of the identity of identity and difference, or of the Many-ness of the One, in religious, philosophical, and scientific contexts: the identification of physical and divine light in Zoroastrianism, Anaxagoras’s cosmic *nous*, Aristotle’s sensible forms, Spinoza’s *deus sive natura*, and modern (nineteenth-century) theories of light and gravitation. Hegel’s treatment of these defining paradoxes in the history of religion, science and philosophy shows the remoteness of his conception of the dialectic of body and soul (and more generally, of materiality and immateriality, objectivity and subjectivity) from a Schellingian conception of absolute knowing in which “everything is the same,” a “night in which, as the saying goes, all cows are black” (*PhenG* W 3:22). For Hegel, the distinction of opposites is an essential connotation of their identity.

Hegel’s pivotal argument here is that upon close (logical) inspection, what we think of as mere form (e.g., the soul) and mere matter (e.g., the organic body) are related to one another like concept and referent. The soul is the concept of the living body; the living body is the referent of the concept of soul; hence, they do not “interact.” This thesis in turn rests on Hegel’s

peculiar brand of idealism—which is at once subjective and objective, or absolute. Section 1 of this chapter is therefore dedicated to the elucidation of the meaning of “idealism” in Hegel. It is here that we find the basis for his claim to have resolved once and for all the puzzle of the connection between body and soul (a claim that, we might add, still goes unnoticed in some of the contemporary literature on Hegel’s “naturalism,” despite its being fully explicit in the texts).¹ The elucidation of the meaning of “idealism” in Hegel’s method is essential not just for appreciating the logical and ontological status of the soul in the *Anthropology*, but also for a full grasp of the further forms of spirit (consciousness, self-consciousness, intelligence, will, self-objectification, and absoluteness) that are treated in the subsequent parts of the system. The chapter closes with an overview of the primal, that is, terrestrial (climatological, geological) features of the soul. These constitute the framework for Hegel’s discussion of the major themes of subsequent sections: the geological distribution of life forms, the geography and history of the specifically human soul, the latter’s original symbiosis with the surroundings, and this symbiosis’s lingering effects at all levels of human civilization.

The bulk of chapter 4, “Animal Life, or *das tierische Subjekt*,” is dedicated to Hegel’s conception of the logical and ontological unity of nature and spirit in the history of our species. The chapter begins by presenting some of the scientific and philosophic background of this understanding. This background includes Hegel’s critical engagement with the anthropologies of Lamarck, Rousseau, Blumenbach, and Kant, as well as with the theological and scientific controversies between monogenist and polygenist accounts of humanity’s origins that had unfolded in Europe since the sixteenth century. While offering textual evidence of the uneasy coexistence of Hegel’s monogenism with his distinctly Montesquieuan understanding of natural spirit’s dependence on climate and geography, this chapter also refutes simplifications of Hegel’s theory of human biological diversity, simplifications found in contemporary commentaries according to which the philosophy of spirit is firmly rooted in a variant of “racism” in today’s broad understanding of the term. To counter these renderings, the third section of this chapter (“From Enlightenment to Reaction”) gives a historical outline of the theoretical and political developments of the question of species (*Gattung*) and race (*Rasse*) during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: from the decidedly antiracist, monogenist, and universalist stance of Johann F. Blumenbach to the British-American reaction against, and distortions of, Blumenbach’s anthropological science by widely influential anti-abolitionists like Samuel G. Morton and James Hunt.

Chapter 5, “No Longer Just Animal Life,” marks the *Anthropology*’s most decisive step in downgrading the naturalistic register in the explanation of the human soul. There is first a presentation of Hegel’s playful but never trivial commentaries on the culturally identifiable traits of ethnicities and peoples—what used to be called “national characters”—particularly those of the European peoples with which he is most familiar. The chapter then turns

to an investigation of the meaning of “qualities” when applied to the soul’s familial and individual levels of differentiation, features for which Hegel chooses the traditional notions of disposition, temperament, and character. This includes Hegel’s incisive criticism of Romantic conceptions of talent and genius, his discussion of (familial and individual) incompatibilities (*Antipathien*) and idiosyncrasies, and his overt skepticism toward character innatism in general—a skepticism whose reasons are laid bare in a second step. This is followed by a discussion of Hegel’s historical targets, that is, medical and philosophical theories focused on psychological features as natural kinds. The second section maps out ancient blueprints for modern taxonomies which can be traced back to the humoral doctrines of Hippocrates and Galen, as well as to Asclepian medicine. The section closes with a succinct discussion of these ancient doctrines’ continued influence, despite formal alterations, in some of today’s psychologies of personality and intelligence types.

Hegel’s skepticism about naturalistic explanations of individual character is grounded in the very conception of a *philosophical* anthropology. Thus, chapter 5 contrasts the scientific pretensions of naturalistic taxonomies with the philosopher’s notion that the “nature” of our species is not fixed by nature but is inescapably co-determined by history. Accordingly, the third and last section of this chapter reconstructs Hegel’s shifting focus from the *qualitative* notions of disposition, temperament, and character to patterns of *change* like age, sexuality, and cyclical rhythms, whose impact on individual propensities, capacities, and attitudes causes their quite radical transformations. My critical examination of this text aims to show that Hegel’s cogitations on dynamic patterns of life exhibits a shift—unjustified in my view—from a genuinely philosophical (i.e., universally anthropological) perspective to a description of prevalent types in modern civil society *as if* these were universal types. Central European bourgeois individuality and bourgeois family relationships, in other words, are being presupposed and used by Hegel here—not unlike Freud would do in related subject matters—as prototypes of the nature of *Mensch*.

This chapter ends by examining the wholly different, truly distinctive conception of human individuality found in Hegel’s discussions of the self-oppositional nature of the individuals of a species whose essence is the universality of consciousness. This paves the way for the topics of the next two chapters: self-feeling individuality as a primitive template of selfhood, and the polar self of the disordered soul.

Chapter 6, “Premonitions of Selfhood, or *die ahnende Seele*,” treats Hegel’s intricate account of the two principal nonconscious activities of the psyche: sentience (*Empfindung*) and feeling (*Gefühl*). An analysis of relevant *Encyclopaedia* passages reaching back into the *Philosophy of Nature* uncovers the premises of Hegel’s argument that natural forms of spirit are the necessary result of the intrinsic logic of nature, and primarily of its processes of self-sublation (*Selbstaufhebung*). Hegel’s explanation of the emergence of the

hylomorphic activity of sentience in living organisms results from his examination (in the “Organics” of the *Philosophy of Nature*) of oscillatory patterns that give rise to the mechanical irritability (*Irritabilität*) and physiological sensibility (*Sensibilität*) of organisms. According to Hegel, these patterns of oscillation are recognizable again at higher and more complex levels of life, namely in the alternation of active and inactive states—the waking and sleeping rhythms—of the individual organism. Despite the appearance of a balance between these alternating poles, Hegel argues that it is the actual predominance of activity over inactivity in the living organism that explains its capacity for self-development. This chapter then proceeds to reconstructing the logic of the connection of sentience to feeling, as well as Hegel’s conception of the self-feeling soul as the real precursor of the conscious “I” of human individuals. The conclusion argues that recognizing the hylomorphic character of Hegel’s “soul” is indispensable for a full appreciation of the role of psychosomatism in his explanations of a wide variety of empirical phenomena like the fetal life, hypnotism, or human insanity—all of which are thematized in the next chapter.

Chapter 7, “Disorders,” centers on five sections of the *Anthropology*’s division entitled “The Feeling Soul.” The focus here is on Hegel’s understanding of the sources, internal structure, taxonomy, and manifestations of human insanity. Hegel locates the inception of generic derangement (*Verrücktheit*) and of madness proper (*Wahnsinn*) in a regressive dynamic by which individuals revert from being conscious of an objective world (“objective consciousness”) to the exclusive and excluding subjectivity of their feelings. While the causes of this retreat into a life of mere feeling may be physical or social traumas—the text stresses the latter through a discussion of the destruction of the political structures (i.e., of individuals’ objective world) in the wake of revolutionary events—Hegel locates the potentiality for this withdrawal in the respective logical features of sentience, feeling, and rationality. The singularity of sensing, the particularity of feeling, and the universality of consciousness help explain the unstable condition of feeling’s middle position: while it no longer consists of singular sensations, it is also not yet a universal grasping through concepts. This precariousness marks out the life of feeling as a condition that is potentially fertile for types of insanity, whose core feature is a state of “being of two minds.” The particular character and the particularistic focus of the feeling soul further explains Hegel’s identification of the common trait of different kinds of insanity with the incapacity to adopt a universal perspective—despite and alongside the endurance of one’s ratiocinating, conscious faculties. This is followed by an elucidation of Hegel’s definition of “derangement” as the painful coexistence of mutually opposing personalities in one individual who is aware of both. The chapter then compares this Hegelian definition to contemporary explanations and categorizations of bipolarism and the schizophrenia spectrum. After showing that Hegel’s basic classification of mental—and that means

psychophysical—diseases is very close to, and even relies upon, previous and contemporaneous studies, principally Immanuel Kant's theory of the "maladies of the head" and Philippe Pinel's psychiatric studies and practice, the chapter concludes by showing that genuine mental disorders are connected by these thinkers to the subjective experience of the objective disorder of their world, especially when the latter is brought about by rapid and radical changes in the institutions of social and political life (*Sittlichkeit*).

The book's conclusion, "Inhabiting the World, or *die Gewohnheit*," is dedicated to Hegel's final considerations on the journey from natural soul to subjective spirit proper (§§409–12). The physiology and anatomy of the human species, including the physiological conditions for thought, are necessary but not sufficient explanations for the glaring peculiarities of human "nature." In contrast to the particular adaptations of other species, the universal expansion of human presence and activities has been rendered possible by the unique capacity of the spiritual dimension of the human psyche to modify and control its corporeal element. For Hegel, this dominance of spirit is proven both by facts from physical anthropology like the upright posture, whose explication has been traditionally entrusted to anatomic science, and by wholly unnatural psychophysical skills like writing and reading, composing and playing music, voluntarily engaging in strenuous activities, or self-training in ascetic practices. The physicality of our organism is not sufficient for explaining human behavior. Since human activities are being exercised despite and even against anatomical and physiological constrictions, Hegel points to the natural will (*der natürliche Wille*) as the other necessary condition which, combined with our physicality, provides the sufficient ground of explanation for the existence of our "second nature." Beyond these considerations pertaining to first and second nature, Hegel's overarching interest in the closing sections of the *Anthropology* is lead by his deeply Stoic conviction that the gradually acquired and reinforced shaping of the world as our *oikos* provides the kind of liberation (*Befreiung*) that makes actual freedom (*Freiheit*) possible in the first place. "Finding oneself at home" in a world of one's own making is the telos and ground of the existence of moral agents who are capable of acting independently of, and even against, the dictates of first nature.

Introduction



Spirit's Humble Beginnings

*Animula vagula blandula / hospes comesque corporis / quae
nunc abibis in loca / pallidula, rigida, nudula?* [Little gentle
wandering soul / guest and companion of the body / what kind
of pallid places / will you now dwell in, so stark and naked?]

—Emperor Hadrian, 2nd century AD

Tales autem nec multos meliores fecit. [Verses like these did he
compose, and not many better ones.]

—Aelius Spartianus, 4th century AD

1. On the Character of Hegel's Text

Except for some of the commentaries preserved in Hegel's Remarks and the student-transcribed Additions to the main text, Hegel's *Anthropology* bears only occasional resemblance to physical and cultural anthropology in today's understanding of these disciplines.

For one thing, in Hegel's work *anthropos* (*homo sapiens*) is the end result, not the presupposed subject matter, of the inquiry—the subject matter being rather life or “natural spirit.” For long stretches in the text, the end result or the actual soul (*wirkliche Seele*) of the human type figures mostly in its preludes—animal-like features that precede and then accompany the attainment of consciousness, self-consciousness, ratiocination, and reason in our species. As in Aristotle's *De anima*, on whose structure and conceptuality Hegel's study relies throughout, what is true of plant life is a fortiori true of animal life, and what is true of animality is a fortiori true of human *animae*. Properly human peculiarities, those on which the psychological sciences dwell almost exclusively, make their appearance only midway in the main text. The preconscious feeling of selfhood, which Hegel calls “selfness” (*Selbstischkeit*), the opaque awareness of affective states as belonging to this

selfness, and the unconscious training of one's body to perform cultural tasks are all basic activities of Hegel's *Seele*. Despite the complexity uncovered by Hegel's detailed treatment, these are comparatively simple activities. They are primitive processes if compared with the historical objectifications of human spirit, not to mention the aesthetic, religious, and speculative self-realizations in which spirit is said to exercise self-comprehension. These lofty subject matters, which are treated in subsequent parts of the encyclopedic system (that is, in *Subjective Spirit's* sections on "Phenomenology" and "Psychology"; in *Objective Spirit*; and in *Absolute Spirit*), all have their roots in the deceptively modest subject matter of the *Anthropology*: the psyche or soul.

As a whole, the exposition in the *Philosophy of Subjective Spirit*, of which the *Anthropology* is but the first part, follows the argument pattern in which Hegel's *Science of Logic* exhibits the three foundational categories of thought and reality: *being*, *essence* and *the concept*. The general notion of soul at work in the *Anthropology* is best grasped as referring to the simplest, immediate *being* of spirit; the notion of consciousness in the "Phenomenology" is best grasped as referring to spirit's self-referential *essence*; and the "Psychology's" intelligent and volitional mind—subjective spirit at its best, as it were—is best grasped as referring to the *concept* proper of subjective spirit. The same pattern is operative inside the *Anthropology* itself, if one could consider it as a self-standing tract: planetary life is the immediate *being* of the soul or natural spirit; sentient and feeling animality represent the mediated, "dirempted" (and under sorrowful circumstances, even split or deranged) *essence* of the soul; and the body-mastering, fully anthropological individuality in the concluding sections of the work provides the *concept* of the perfected soul.

If compared with the functional resources and wealth of content of subsequent forms of spirit like consciousness and intelligence, and more so if compared with the magnificent or ghastly objectifications of spirit in the history of the species, the soul is a poor reality. Hegel repeatedly laments its abstractness (*Abstraktheit*). The soul's stirrings are tentative; its failures are chronic. Self-alienation, for example, is an inbuilt aspect of being-soul. The ever-present possibility of derangement's erupting in human life is rooted in the soul's inertial tendency to regress to a previous, simpler, more abstract stage of itself (a natural tendency that in no way excludes a role for external traumatic events, especially of a historical nature,¹ as triggers of the reversal). From a natural perspective, as Rousseau never tired of pointing out, humans are fundamentally deranged animals. Irritability, smell, taste, and sexual urges are as important to the makeup of the soul as are dreaming and inner feeling, symbiosis with the physical world, or retreat into that collection of chimeras we call insanity. The soul's activities are repetitious: memorization and the formation of bodily habit are some of its proudest achievements. Without the habituation of the human body, there is no skill; and without skill, emotional energy and intellectual attention could never be diverted away from natural needs. According to Hegel, a finely discriminating hand, the erect posture,

and the forward gaze are the anatomic, physiological, and behavioral counterparts of the self-conditioning of our species' soul.

The comparative simplicity of the soul is deceptive, however. Just like the nutritive-reproductive function (the *threptikon*) and the perceiving function (the *aisthētikon*) exercised by Aristotle's *psuchē* on its way to higher functions, so Hegel's soul, while dwelling in lowly circumstances and exerting unintelligent and repetitive functions, potentially contains in itself spirit's higher activities. In an interpretive stretch (whose broader context is discussed below), Hegel likens the soul at once to Aristotle's "mind asleep" and to the "passive intellect":

The soul is not only for itself immaterial, but is rather the universal immateriality of nature, the latter's simple ideal life. The soul is the *substance*, the absolute foundation of all particularization and singularization of spirit, so that *the latter* has in it [the soul] all the material [*Stoff*] of its determination and the soul remains the pervasive, identical ideality of that determination. But in this still abstract determination the soul is only the *sleep* of spirit—the *passive nous* of Aristotle that, as far as *possibility*, is all things. (*Enc* §389)²

In the introductory sections to the general concept of subjective spirit, Hegel may appear to be using the sleeping and waking tropes in a rather loose manner. He writes, for example, that "*consciousness* awakens in the *soul*" (*PhS Enc* §387). But in the body of the *Anthropology* these tropes' connection to Aristotle's notions of the sleeping and waking *psuchē* or to Leibniz's dormant and active monad are more direct. Hegel states, for example, that the primary objects of the soul's activity in its feeling condition (*die fühlende Seele*) are the very sensory impressions (*Empfindungen*) that already fill it and which it now actively finds in itself. This activity closely mirrors the physio-psychological process by which the contents of an individual's slumbering mind are conserved and may be recollected in that same individual's waking state. In other words: the process by which the soul is said to find and transform its sentient contents into feelings is the same by which the mind is said to find and transform the contents of its sleeping state into the memories and cognitions of its waking self.

As in all other divisions of the *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, the main text of each section of the *Anthropology* sketches the logic of its subject's development, only to compensate for this hermetic minimalism with the somewhat overwhelming profusion of commentaries, illustrations, details, and detours offered in the Remarks and Additions. For example, the ten lines of §405 defining "The feeling soul in its immediacy" are followed by an extensive Remark and wide-ranging Addition that appeal to the reader's familiarity with immediate or non-reflected feeling. We are reminded here of the immediacy or non-discursive nature of dream and presentiment; of the paradoxical

connection of the human fetus to its mother (two individuals, one self); of continuities and disruptions between our self-understanding and our innermost character—in nineteenth-century parlance, between self-knowledge and one's *Genius*.³ Similarly, Hegel's sober explication of what it means to acquire a feeling of self in the main text of §407 and §408 is followed, in the respective Additions, by some of the most far-reaching and meticulous treatments philosophy has ever dedicated to the concept of selfhood losing itself.

Virtually every topic of interest to the foundations of contemporary clinical psychology, behaviorism, psychoanalysis, and philosophical psychology is encapsulated in the Remarks and Additions of this comparatively small work by the somewhat misleading title of *Anthropology*. We find discussed the physiological basis of mind, the simultaneously somatic and mental (*geistig*) character of standard and erratic behavior; the iceberg-like nature of individual and collective egoity; and the nebulous confines between somatic and mental order and disorder. Unsurprisingly, the details, terminology, and casuistry of Hegel's treatment of the psyche are steeped in ancient, medieval, and nineteenth-century science, medicine, and psychology. The psychiatric, physiological, and anthropological theories of Hegel's time largely consisted of critical refinements of earlier Enlightenment zoology, biology, medicine, and psychology. For example, the impact of climate and geography on animal species, on the differentiation of the human species in races, and even on cultural (national or *völkisch*) traits features in some sections of Hegel's *Anthropology* with a prominence one would expect from a French *encyclopédiste*, but not from a German idealist. Hegel's focus eventually shifts to the endogenous (for us: genetic) foundations of individual disposition, temperament, and character; the species-affirming (for us: evolutionary) functions of human life-stages and sexuality; the alternation of sleeping and waking states in the economy of individual animal life; the primordial "sympathy" of the living body in hypnotic states with the magnetic properties of inorganic bodies; the cataleptic, sleep-walking, visionary, and divinatory capacities so prominent among ancient peoples and so irrelevant—though never extinguished—among the moderns; the mind's unmediated bond with, or devastating alienation from, bodily parts; the continuous line connecting sane and insane states in the human soul; the importance of distinguishing among mental weakness (*Blödsinn*), folly (*Verrücktheit*), and insanity proper (*Wahnsinn*); and the role of the natural will (*der natürliche Wille*) in the posture, language, and skills of the human body.

There is much here to invite condescension in first-time readers of Hegel's *Anthropology*. Before yielding to this sentiment, however, one may want to compare Hegel's account with contemporary established scientific wisdom on such themes as dream therapy, the epistemological foundations of psychoanalysis, the nebulous outcomes of psychotherapies, the physical effects of placebos, the triumphs and charlatanry of both established and alternative medicine, famous philosophical cogitations about individual "mirror stages" and "misrecognitions," and popular notions of the split, the multiple, and the

healthy personality. Contemporary theories of mind's so-called embodiment (to use the potentially dualistic terminology of twentieth-century phenomenology)⁴ show that, since these theories claim to derive their theoretical apparatus from experimental or perceptual experience, they are at their core reelaborations of what they resolutely reject: either physicalistic reductionism or "Cartesian dualism."⁵ The theoretical possibilities that an attentive reading of Hegel on the soul opens for phenomenological, psychological, and psychoanalytic research can help sharpen the theoretical tools of today's often opaque conceptualizations of the psyche. To choose but one example (discussed further in chapter 7), the somewhat vaguely defined "bipolarism" of established psychiatry⁶ owes its core meaning to eighteenth-century Mesmerian theories of the living animal as a bipolar magnet, which Hegel discusses in the Additions to §402 and §406. Mesmer's theories and related treatments were at first widely popular, then derided, and finally outlawed by royal decree in their century. The idea of the magnetic properties of animal bodies was in its turn rooted in never entirely suppressed ancient conceptions of the intimate connection of live organisms with cosmic physical forces—conceptions we even find embedded in today's revival of circadian rhythm studies, to name one example. Although psychological and psychiatric research has been generally scornful of classical philosophical theorizing on its subject, some of this research begins to open to the idea that a "science of the psyche" has to be a science of natural *subjectivity* and is thus ill-served by methods and conjectures patterned exclusively after the sciences of natural *objects*. Even beyond the world of philosophy, Hegel's realistic, non-reductionist, hylomorphic account, whose explication is attempted in this book, may perhaps open new and useful perspectives on the reality of the psyche.

2. Text and Context

Michael Jon Petry's three-volume critical edition and translation of Hegel's "*Philosophy of Subjective Spirit*" (1978) contains an extraordinary wealth of information about Hegel's sources and the scientific and philosophic controversies of the time. Whenever necessary, the present study makes use of Petry's research in order to illuminate Hegel's line of argument. Petry also discusses the historical precedents of Hegel's holistic understanding of the soul, as well as aspects of earlier theories that Hegel counters, embraces, or (more often) incorporates into his own. The aim of the present volume is to think through and interpret, as sympathetically as reason allows, Hegel's narration of the main phases of soul-like existence, including his arguments for the necessity of the soul's transitions from one phase to the next—which Hegel claims to be grounded in logical necessity.

This book is meant to shed light on an extraordinarily vibrant, highly coherent, only occasionally obscure work that has been much neglected until

the recent past. It is well known that for a long time, through the vagaries of French and Anglophone receptions of classical German Idealism, Hegel's importance as a major figure of modern philosophy was reduced to the genial 1807 *Phenomenology of Spirit*—albeit in disregard of the author's own assessment (quoted below) and of his later systematization of the core concept of a phenomenology of consciousness in his mature work.

Fortunately, a small number of recent studies⁷ have made a convincing case for the importance of Hegel's own understanding of his philosophy of subjective, objective, and absolute spirit as being grounded in a philosophy of the soul. Most of these investigations highlight Hegel's conception of the nature of the psyche as intermediate between self-external (i.e., in Hegel's technical use of this term, purely physical) and self-inwardizing nature—or between nature in the ordinary sense and natural spirit. Consequently, they also stress the character of the soul as an existent that has at once material and immaterial dimensions, whereby in the human case the immateriality of the soul is mostly meant to denote the social, cultural, or historical affections of our psyche. Yet one would be hard-pressed to find in this literature an explanation of Hegel's argument for the joint material and immaterial ontological status of the soul—that is, an argument showing that nature-or-nurture debates are prisoners of a false dilemma, or that the soul-paradox can actually be grasped in rational terms. Some scholars⁸ do rightly stress the jointly twin aspect of Hegel's *Seele*, but interpret it in the light of the philosopher's urge to “reconcile” nature and spirit. One result of this view is that Hegelian pronouncements like the following: “the soul must dirempt itself” or “the soul is midway between nature and spirit” come across as plausible but arbitrary and, in the end, dogmatic. Readers who do not themselves venture to engage Hegel's texts are left with the impression that the persuasiveness of those claims is produced more by repetition than by argument—hence perhaps the scant attention accorded to Hegel's treatise on the soul. The following chapters offer instead an explication of Hegel's hylomorphism that goes beyond his alleged theoretical quest for the “reconciliation” of opposites. Rather than the unification (*Versöhnung*) of ontologically opposite principles, Hegel's stress is on the internal diremption of the soul's original unity (*Einheit*)—a unity that exists despite the diremption and, thanks to it, is actually a living unity (*lebendige Einheit*). One way in which the present study attempts to address this is by explaining in appropriate detail Hegel's key concepts, as well as some of his technical terms, by reference to their position and thus their function in his philosophical system. Hence, the following brief external history of the *Encyclopaedia* and an epigrammatic sketch of its structure may be useful frameworks for appreciating the qualified defense of Hegel's theory of being-soul that is being offered in this study.



With regard to the composition and publication history of the *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences* it bears noting that, in contrast to less fortunate philosophers of the Western canon, Hegel lived to personally revise and publish his complete philosophical system not one but three times: in 1817, 1827, and 1830.⁹ Had Hegel considered his *prima philosophia* or *Science of Logic*—the so-called Greater Logic, whose three divisions he published in 1812,¹⁰ 1813, and 1816, respectively—to be either pernicious or dispensable (as has been argued),¹¹ he would not have included a short version of it in every edition of the *Encyclopaedia*. More importantly, he would not have painstakingly revised the first division of the Greater Logic until shortly before his death (1831, published 1832), nor would he have written a new preface to it. Furthermore, had Hegel's judgment been that the 1807 *Phenomenology of Spirit* was the most adequate statement of his philosophy, he would have eventually changed its title (*System of the Science. Part One, the Phenomenology of Spirit* [*System der Wissenschaft. Erster Theil, die Phänomenologie des Geistes*]) to reflect this assessment. There would also have been lectures on the *Phenomenology* from the Heidelberg or Berlin periods, and in the last year of his life the philosopher would have avoided writing, on a sheet included in his personal copy of the work: "Peculiar earlier work, do not revise—concerning the time of composition."¹² In other words, Hegel would have revised this genial work several times instead of abandoning it, to borrow Marx's expression, to the gnawing criticism of the mice.

In evaluating the relevance of the *Anthropology* to Hegel's philosophy, including its role as the premise for the *Encyclopaedia* "Phenomenology" and "Psychology," it is therefore worth bearing in mind that this work underwent and survived all three of the author's revisions of his system of philosophy.¹³

As for the systematic context in which the *Anthropology* is embedded, the following remarks will have to suffice.

In keeping with the Stoic division of philosophy into logic, physics, and ethics, Hegel's system opens quite traditionally with an exposition of logic or *prima philosophia* as the foundation of the edifice, followed by a philosophy of nature and a philosophy of spirit. Hegel's "lesser" *Logic* in the *Encyclopaedia* bears the same title as the "greater" *Science of Logic*, published and partially revised by Hegel between 1812 and 1831. In both versions, the subject matter of this *prima philosophia* is articulated in a logic of being (*das Sein*), of essence (*das Wesen*), and of the concept (*der Begriff*). Taken together, the two main divisions of the *Encyclopaedia* that follow the *Science of Logic* (the *Philosophy of Nature* and the *Philosophy of Spirit*) develop a comprehensive theory of reality. This means that they take their content not, as the *Logic* does, from the intrinsic laws and contents of thinking but from the experienced, observed, and conceptualized worlds of nature and history. Yet in order for both the real domains of nature and spirit to be explicable at all, it must be possible, Hegel thinks, to show that they conform in some specifiable way to the logical principles of *prima philosophia*. If they did

not, nature and mind would be unintelligible or, what amounts to the same thing, their theoretical accounts would be wholly arbitrary. The real (whether nature or spirit) must be studied, then, first, as a being that is intelligible in terms of qualities and relations; second, as the essence of which that being is the expression, that is, as that which is preserved throughout the alterations of qualities and relations; and third, the real must be explained in such a way that its being and essence, though distinguishable from one another, become fully intelligible only as a unit, the concept of actuality.

The *Anthropology*, the first part of *Subjective Spirit*, is the immediate systematic successor of the *Philosophy of Nature's* third and last section, which is entitled "Organic Physics." The *Anthropology* is also, as mentioned above, the direct predecessor of the "Phenomenology." Its main text (*Enc* §§388–412) follows an introduction to the general concept of spirit (*PhS Enc* §§377–86) and a single introductory section (*PhS Enc* §387) dedicated to the specific concept of subjective spirit. The study of the *Anthropology's* subject matter therefore straddles the studies of nature and of spirit. As will be shown in the following chapters, this subject matter is best understood as sharing in natural and spiritual reality at once. The *Philosophy of Nature* concludes with an exposition of the concept of the living organism, that is, of the individual or "singular totality" that unifies mechanical, chemical, and organic processes. The *Philosophy of Spirit* begins from the latter, that is, from life on Earth—the complete if small-scale cosmos of the immaterial forces of material nature.

Due to its systematic position, it is easy to see that the *Anthropology* provides new tools for the account of living nature at the point at which the *Philosophy of Nature* has exhausted its explanatory power. Spontaneous motility, passive affection and sentience, active feeling, and the presentiment of selfhood in self-feeling are phenomena that far exceed the explicatory schemes of natural philosophy and the physical sciences. Hence, the account of advanced forms of life must be pursued with different criteria and under a different heading: "The natural soul" (*Enc* §391). The philosophy of the real, Hegel states in the Introduction to the *Encyclopaedia*, is a "*thinking consideration* of objects" (*Enc* §2). The further this conceptually informed observation of objects delves into realities even more complex than planetary movements or chemical interactions, the more compelling it becomes to incorporate their study in that of *Geist*, whether in its natural, subjective, objective, or absolute modes of existence.

In the opening sections of the *Anthropology* we find ourselves therefore at the crossover point from organicity to subjectivity. This part of philosophy can only begin with an account of the simple existence of life, that is, of the multitude of self-moving, self-feeding, kind-reproducing organisms that wander the Earth. From here, it moves on to the explanation of motions in which mechanism and "reactivity" dwindle to make space for increasingly self-directed activities—and indeed, to self-induced actions.

One reason for some enduring misunderstandings of Hegel's (and other German thinkers') *Seele* may lie in the fact that the German language lacks a noun that is straightforwardly derived from the Latin terms *animal* and *anima*. The German renders these with two distinct Gothic-derived terms, respectively, *Tier* and *Seele*. *Tier* derives from the Gothic *dius* (Lat. *deus*) which, just as the Latin *animal*, originally denoted a breathing thing. As befits the animistic cultures of all our ancestors, divinity and animality have long been seen as sharing the awe-inspiring character of being alive. Aristotle's somewhat skeptical-sounding mention of the pre-Socratic etymologies of *zēn* and *psuchē* in the first chapter of *De anima* is worth quoting here:

They etymologize according to their theories; some identify soul with heat, deriving *zēn* from *zein*, and contend that this identity accounts for the word for life; others say that what is cold is called soul from the respiratory process and consequent "cooling down," deriving *psuchē* from *psuchēin*. Such, then, are the views regarding soul that have come down to us and the grounds on which they are held. (*Da* I.2 405b26–30)¹⁴

It is appropriate here to anticipate what is discussed in more detail in chapter 2 with regard to Hegel's choice of a passage from Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Λ as the most fitting conclusion to his *Encyclopaedia*. The Aristotelian passage contains the sentence: "We say therefore that the eternal, best animal is the divine [*phamen de ton theon einai zōon aidion, ariston*]" (*Metaphysics* Λ 1072b30).¹⁵

As is the case for *Tier* and *animal*, even the likely root of *Seele*, namely, the Gothic *saiwala*, indicates that which has labor pains, internal motion, or breathing; in other words, that whose "pneumatic" activity is perceived as being wholly self-induced—a sort of motion that differs from all other types of motion in having an apparently wholly endogenous origin. Thus, in the German language the referent of *Seele* originally overlaps in significant parts with that of animal nature, *tierische Natur*. Of course, Hegel's use of *Seele* implies more than this. Yet these linguistic peculiarities and conceptual connotations help highlight one important meaning of Hegel's use of "soul," especially when it occurs in the plural form: far from being pure forms (let alone heavenly ghosts), *Seelen* are the primitive, wild, and bewildering instances of "divine," self-induced, entelechistic natural motion—self-external substances becoming subjective.

Chapter 1



Aristotelian Roots

The soul is the *existing* Concept, the existence of the speculative.
—Hegel, *Anthropology* §403, Remark

1. On “Unraveling the Sense” of *psuchē*

Hegel’s systematic arrangement of the several ways in which nature and spirit coincide and differ makes it clear that for him, before there could be a journey of consciousness, a pilgrimage of reason, or an odyssey of spirit proper—to borrow from H. S. Harris’s enduring images¹—there must have been a wandering of spirit-as-soul.

One could be tempted to say that Hegel’s *Anthropology* describes the peculiar meanderings of spirit through nature, were it not that the distinction between spirit and nature is not this work’s presupposition, but its result. The subject matter of the *Anthropology* is therefore better characterized as that self-altering capacity of living nature whose logic, stages, and manifestations were first exhibited, albeit much more succinctly than in Hegel’s treatise, in Aristotle’s *De anima*.

Empirical psychology, Hegel argues in the Introduction to the *Philosophy of Subjective Spirit*, has either altogether exorcised the metaphysical foundation of its subject matter, or it has retained a poor version of it in the form of a formal metaphysics of mental faculties that has lost from sight the self-referential, speculative nature of the psyche. By contrast,

Aristotle’s books on the soul, with his treatments of its particular aspects and states, are . . . still the eminent or rather the only work of speculative interest on this topic. The essential purpose of a philosophy of spirit can only be to reintroduce the Concept in the knowledge of spirit, thus also unraveling once again the sense of those Aristotelian books. (*PhS Enc* §378)

Hegel's conception of spirit's emergence from nature is sometimes understood as implying an overcoming (not unfrequently accompanied by the disclaimer "partial") of nature by its other, that is, by spirit. But a careful analysis of relevant passages from crucial texts recommends a different interpretation. The following two excerpts may serve to set the stage for the more detailed discussion to follow. The first excerpt is taken from the *Philosophy of Nature* and the second from the *Philosophy of Spirit*, specifically from the *Anthropology*.

The movement [of nature] . . . consists . . . in this, that . . . the Idea moves *inwardly* out of its immediacy and externality, which is *death*, so as to be, first, *something living*; and further, so as to sublimate² even this determinacy, in which it is only life, and to generate itself as the existence of spirit. (*PhN Enc* §251)³

Spirit that has become has . . . the meaning that nature self-sublates over against itself [*an ihr selbst*] as the untrue, so that spirit presupposes itself as this universality, yet no longer a *self-external* one of bodily singularity, but one that is, in its concreteness and totality, *simple* universality in which spirit is *soul*, not yet spirit. (*Enc* §388)

According to the first passage, nature, which is one mode of existence of the whole of actuality or of the Idea, is not at first sublated, let alone left behind, by an other of itself.⁴ It is nature itself that overcomes itself in this sublation, first by becoming alive, and further, by becoming natural spirit. According to the second passage, spirit is not something the philosopher may presuppose. It is not a given, not something found ready-made, not the Word that simply was in the beginning. It is a result of nature's overcoming its own merely external mode of existing "over against itself." Full-fledged forms and activities of spirit—consciousness, for example—therefore presuppose simpler forms, the most primitive ones being indeed so simple that they can hardly be identified as properly spiritual: they are spirit in a particular mode of its existence—a being of spirit that is not yet fully spirit proper.

An existent that is neither pure exteriority nor yet full interiority, caught in the process of inwardizing its own mere externality—this is what being-soul amounts to. The various phases of soul's becoming that the *Anthropology* exhibits and accounts for—the sentient, feeling, self-feeling, habit-forming, anthropic soul-form—are precisely the kinds of existence in which spirit is, in brazen self-contradiction, still nature. Though rooted in mechanical, chemical, and organic motions, the soul eventually does overcome its mere physicality—but only in the sense that the soul takes possession of it, never shaking it off.

Though metaphoric language may be needed to introduce speculative conceptions, it is a poor metaphor which suggests that corporeity "houses" finite spirit. One would be closer to the truth of the matter by stating conversely

that finite spirit gradually takes hold of its own corporeity; only once it has become intelligence and will does spirit draw a clear demarcation between this corporeity as object, and itself as subject.

The result of the coming together of physical, chemical, and organic forces in a “concrete”, that is, internally differentiated unit is the kind of singular entity that properly deserves the name of substance. In the context of a study of living nature, this is the entity that we may legitimately call, following Aristotle, the soul-substance.

Hegel’s two standard and mutually equivalent expressions for this concept of substance are “concrete unity” (*konkrete Einheit*) and “individual totality” (*individuelle Totalität*). Both find a terse formulation in the definition of individuality given in the greater *Logic*’s “Doctrine of the Concept”: “Individuality . . . is in and for itself the concrete principle of negative unity, [and] as such, itself totality, a unity that dirempts itself in the determinate differences of the concept while abiding in its self-same universality” (WdL W 6:426).⁵

The necessity of conceiving individuals as totalities above and beyond their being composites is also an important feature of Aristotle’s thinking in these matters. It is easy to recognize in Aristotle’s discussions of the *sunolon* the blueprint of Hegel’s *individuelle Totalität*. In *De anima*, for example, criticizing his predecessors’ understanding of cognitive powers in terms of an affinity between elements of the soul and elements of the objects being cognized, Aristotle asks the rhetorical question: “Granted . . . that it is possible for the soul to know and to perceive the constituent elements of all these composite things, with what will it know or perceive the whole itself [*to sunolon*]?” (*Da* I.5 409b30–31). The implication is that the soul can only cognize the whole if it is itself more than a composite. But it is in the *Metaphysics* that we find the most explicit characterizations of substance as non-combinatorial unity: “The substance is the indwelling form, of which and of the matter [of which] the substance is said to be the unity [*he sunolos legetai ousia*]” (*Metaphysics* Z 1037a30–32). A few passages later, Aristotle draws a contrast between combination, *to suntheton*, and unity, *to sunolon*, in order to explain our grasp of “syllable” and “flesh” as things that are *not* aggregates of elements, whether these be, respectively, letters or fire and earth (*Metaphysics* Z 1041b11–33). In the next book, we find the claim that without distinguishing between soul on the one hand and the oneness of body and soul on the other, the concept of *zōon* becomes hopelessly ambiguous (*Metaphysics* H 1043a29–b4). The obscurity can be lifted, Aristotle argues, by showing the inadequacy of notions like participation, communion, composition, or connection (*methexis*, *sunthesis*, *sundesmos*, and *sunousia*) to express the genuine oneness of the matter and form of one and the same actual thing:

Owing to the difficulty about unity some speak of participation . . . others speak of communion . . . and others say life is a composition or connection of soul with body. But, as has been said, the proximate

matter and the form are one and the same thing, the one potentially, the other actually . . . For each thing is a unity, and the potential and the actual are like one. (*Metaphysics* H 1045b18–21)

Hegel's understanding of "soul" in the *Anthropology* is very much indebted to this Aristotelian metaphysics of substance.⁶ This conception has far-reaching consequences, as we shall see, for the philosophy of real spirit.

2. Hylomorphism

Against this metaphysical background, the so-called "soul-body problem" strikes Hegel as an ill-formulated because ill-conceived conundrum that can find a clear and definitive, though certainly not a simple, resolution only in a speculative concept of the soul. Hegel's conception is a type of hylomorphism that reaches back to Greek philosophy (where the concept but not the word exists) and enriches it through philosophical and scientific insights accumulated in the intervening centuries.

Hegel locates the full-fledged beginning of this hylomorphic conception in the Aristotelian notion of *zēin*, "to be living." One of the more explicit passages that corroborates Hegel's interpretation contains the famous (and often misapplied) simile of the seal's imprint in the wax, which Aristotle offers in the broader context of his account of *psuchē* as life:

There is no need to enquire whether soul and body are one, any more than whether the wax and the imprint are one; or, in general, whether the matter of a thing is the same with that of which it is the matter. (*Da* II.1 412b6–8)

The compound word "hylomorphism," combining *hulē* (matter) and *morphē* (shape), strongly suggests a conception of physical objects as compounds. It has been used, however, with vastly different meanings since its first employments—all of which seem to have occurred in the last 200 years. A brief survey of these uses will help sharpen the contours of the term as it is used here, namely as a hermeneutic key to Hegel's ontology of being-soul.

On the face of it, the term "hylomorphism" itself may strike us as either trivial or reductive. It is trivial, if all that is intended by it is to bestow a name on the obscure concept of a combination or mingling of matter and form. It is hopelessly reductive, if it is employed in one of the ways described in the following paragraphs.

The first difficulty with this compound word is its incorporation of *morphē* (shape) instead of *eidos* (form). In spite of Aristotle's association of *morphē* with *eidos* at the onset of the second book of *De anima* ("shape or form, by virtue of which" everything is said "to be this or that"; *Da* II.1 412a8), his further

uses show clearly that living bodies are unities of *hulē* and *eidos*, not of *hulē* and its visible shape. Thus, if “hylo-morphism” is taken too literally, it is misleading. It ought perhaps to be renamed “hylo-eidism.” In either case, however, the compound word suggests a composite referent, while the living individuality to which it refers is not meant to be a combination of two elements but, as discussed above, a thorough and original unity: a *sunolon* or *Einheit*.

These difficulties notwithstanding, there are good reasons for a qualified employment of “hylomorphism.” For one thing, it is a convenient shorthand for Aristotle’s holistic conception of life, where forms or essences can be active only in the presence of material bodies—and indeed only of appropriate kinds of bodies, namely those structurally predisposed to or “organized” for life (see *Da* II.1 412a20). The overarching notion that makes this unity of *eidos* and *hulē* intelligible is that of the *energeia* proper to each living body, or its *entelecheia*. This is the endogenous striving of each organic totality toward its own completeness or, perhaps better, it is the activity innately appropriate to each. Aristotle’s teleological conception is therefore, properly speaking, an “entelechism.” In view of Hegel’s own explication of the logic of living individuality in the *Science of Logic*, even his theory of life forms could be quite appropriately called an entelechism, since he himself refers to the completeness toward which life strives as its “concept”: “Since the concept is immanent in what is living, the purposiveness [*Zweckmässigkeit*] of it must be understood as *internal*; the concept exists in it as determinate concept, different from and pervasive of the living being’s exteriority” (*WdL* W 6:476). However, if one’s concern is to convey the ontologically polar nature of Hegel’s *Seele*—as is the case here—the term “hylomorphism” shall be the preferred term.

A study by Gideon Manning (2013) on the history of this word in Latin, Anglophone, and German contexts exemplifies the many ways in which “hyle-morphism” or “hylomorphism” has been employed. While one might argue that variations on this concept are as old as Anaxagoras’s doctrine of the immaterial mind moving the physical cosmos, the word itself is of relatively recent, nineteenth-century coinage. One would expect the common thread of all its uses to be some interpretation of the Aristotelian matter-form unit that makes up all things. As a matter of fact, however, there has been no univocal employment of the term in modern philosophy, theology, or science. Manning’s study exposes some surprising uses.

In 1818, Schleiermacher wrote to Jacobi:

Anthropomorphism, or allow me to call it ideomorphism, is . . . unavoidable for the interpretation of religious feeling. Whether hylo-morphism (which I do not wish to be understood atomistically, but in the way implied by the most living physics) be equally indispensable for the study of nature, I cannot decide, as I understand it too little. (quoted in Manning 2013, 177)

Of interest here is the parenthetical remark. For Schleiermacher, hylomorphism means some sort of physicalism: not traditional atomism, but the physicalism of “the most living physics [*die lebendigste Physik*].” The comparison of hylomorphism with anthropo- or ideomorphism in this letter shows that here the suffix “-morphism” has nothing to do with the form of a matter, but simply indicates a theoretical perspective on a subject matter; just as religion is unavoidably shaped by a concept of *anthropos* or of *idea*, so natural science is unavoidably shaped by the concept of *hylē*. There is no trace here of hylomorphism as a metaphysical theory of the relation of matter and form, except for the hint at “living physics” by which Schleiermacher appears to refer to non-atomistic biological science.

Seventy years later, we find a similar use of “hylomorphism” in a study by the British theologian James Martineau.⁷ He contrasts hylomorphism with anthropomorphism and biomorphism. These signify three theoretical frameworks centered on three principles: anthropomorphism is a theory of thought, biomorphism is a theory of life, and hylomorphism is a theory of matter. Martineau’s usage is especially interesting because it shows how hylomorphism ended up being conceived as a surrogate for straightforward physicalism—perhaps just the kind of hylomorphism that Schleiermacher had little understanding of and no wish to discuss.

More intuitively plausible uses of our term are found in nineteenth-century Thomistic interpretations of Aristotle and Scholasticism. While firmly rejecting reductionist accounts of nature and the human species in particular, Catholic thinkers were nonetheless keen on demonstrating the compatibility of the church’s teachings with modern science. This included showing that the concept of a material substance (even when mechanistically understood) is compatible with that of an immaterial substance—thereby allowing for the plausibility of immortal souls. Thomistic metaphysics appeared uniquely suited to bridge the gap between modern science and Catholic philosophy. As Manning’s study shows, Tilmann Pesch (1836–99) was the first to champion an explicit interpretation of Thomism as a *systema hylomorphicum*.⁸ The term “hylomorphism” spread quickly among Catholic writers and soon became a common designator of medieval matter-form Aristotelianism.

Hegel’s hylomorphism of the soul, though not unrelated to these conceptions, is more directly a corollary of his notion of the Idea as the unity of concept and reality.⁹ This difficult notion may be clarified at first by recourse to its role in Hegelian contexts quite remote from his metaphysics of the soul. The subject matter of the *Outlines of the Philosophy of Right*, for example, is introduced as follows: “*The philosophical science of right* has for its object *the Idea of right*, [i.e.,] the concept of right and its actualization” (RPh §1). In other words, the political institutions that embody objective spirit through human history must be understood as realizations of the concept of right; the totality encompassing the concept and its realizations is what the “Idea of right” refers to. In the same way, in the *Anthropology* living individuals or

souls are conceived as realizations of the concept of life. Their totality is the Idea of life. The living individual is a unity of self-externality (corporeality) and inwardness (spirit). The abstract blueprint of this actualization is provided by the logical notion of an identity that contains difference in itself. “The Idea” refers, first, to the existent whole of nature and spirit; second, to their logical difference; and third, to their real identity. The soul’s peculiar character, that is, its being an actively self-relating unit, is a microcosm of the Idea.

Hegel does not argue that Aristotle’s pre-monotheistic, thus also pre-dualistic account of living and thinking substances derives all the implications that objectively follow from its premises and arguments. Yet in his reading, Aristotle’s account does entail a specifically speculative conception of the psyche that necessarily follows from those premises and arguments. The *De anima* contains for Hegel, in other words, all the fundamentals of a rational account of spirit’s development from, compatibility with, and, as he likes to put it, “overgrasp” of physical nature. Hegel’s term *übergreifen* conveys the logical fact that, while the concept (*Begriff*) of X has simply X as its content, the thought of X’s externality necessarily comprises three notions: X, the concept of X, and the notion of their mutual externality. In other words, the concept of a thought-independent object can only be a concept “overgrasping” its content, itself, and their relation.

This Hegelian reading also implies that *De anima* contains an *ante litteram* refutation of all subsequent attempts to explain the relation of soul and living body in dualistic terms. It is notable that Hegel does not number Cartesian philosophy among these attempts. An attentive reading of his 1820–21 lecture on that apparently most unlikely of hylomorphists, René Descartes, is instructive with regard to Hegel’s own understanding of early modern philosophy’s contribution to the rediscovery of the unity of the living individual. Hegel’s soul-hylomorphism can be better appreciated by taking note of his interpretation not just of ancient philosophy, but also of early modern thought.

3. The Real Unity of the Cartesian Man

Hegel’s lecture on Descartes’s philosophy opens the second section, entitled “Period of the Thinking Understanding,” of part 3 of the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, which is dedicated to the modern period.¹⁰

Hegel’s reconstruction of Cartesianism centers around two basic considerations, whose implications conflict with widespread understandings of Cartesian philosophizing as a paradigm case of dualistic thought—interpretations rather popular in contemporary philosophy.

The first of Hegel’s claims is that Descartes’s “heroic” (i.e., foundational) deed in modern philosophy (“er ist so ein Heros,” *GeschPh* W 20:123) does not consist of having introduced a radically new principle, but rather

in having reaffirmed an ancient one. In this passage, Hegel pays tribute to Descartes for having emboldened philosophy to “return to its proper soil.” Second, this return is not just epistemological—it is not just the reintroduction of skepticism into philosophy. It is rather, and primarily, a return to ancient ontology. In Hegel’s reading, Descartes would have recovered the immediate unity of thinking and being that is original to thinking and thus first makes its appearance in the beginnings of philosophic thought. Despite the inconsistencies and apparent lack of sophistication in Descartes’s terminology, there is in his philosophy a thorough understanding of the unity of thinking and being in knowledge (*GeschPh* W 20:128). This is reiterated at multiple junctures in this lecture,¹¹ for example in the following passages:

I think, this thinking contains immediately my being; this, he [Descartes] says, is the absolute foundation of all philosophy . . . Thinking as being and being as thinking, this is my certainty, “I.” (*GeschPh* W 20:131)

Through the fact that the activity of mediating¹² is simultaneously a sublating of the mediation, it is also immediacy. In this way, there is being in thinking; being is a poor determination, it is the *abstractum* from the concreteness of thinking. (*GeschPh* W 20:134)

With that, philosophy has regained its proper terrain, [the fact] that thinking proceeds from thinking as what is in itself certain, not from an externality, not from a givenness, not from an authority, but purely from the freedom that lies in this: “I think.” (*GeschPh* W 20:135)

Descartes is the true founder of modern philosophy in that he liberates thinking from the frocks of theology and returns it to its naked ancient self. He returns to knowledge aimed at answering the first command, *know thyself*. At the same time, his thought reflects the underlying interest of his epoch: all prejudices that have accrued to philosophy through the centuries must now be forsaken so that the human being may once again be sure of himself.

More precisely, Hegel understands this Cartesian second grounding of philosophy as a return to the Stoic principle that self-reflective thinking is the prototype of human freedom. Notwithstanding the letter of Descartes’s ratiocinating philosophy (*Verstandesphilosophie*), underneath its fabled substance dualism there lies a deeper insight (a “deep inward process,” W 20:128) into the rational necessity of the original, underivable unity of thinking and being. While the order of exposition in the *Meditations* begins from thinking and moves on to being, the logical order exhibits their coincidence. Citing Descartes’s *De Methodo*,¹³ Hegel argues that despite the author’s use of *ergo* in the *cogito* formulation of this particular work—this indicator being entirely absent from the text of the *Meditations*—“I am” does not follow from

“I think” through the addition of a premise. Rather, the existential statement simply makes explicit a connotation implicit in the concept of the first statement. There is no syllogism here; only an immediate inference. Despite its awkward formulations (“*cogito, sum*” or “*cogito ergo sum*”), Hegel reads this foundational insight as a singular instantiation of the universal activity of thinking (see *GeschPh* W 20:131).¹⁴ Using the logical term *Vermittlung* (mediation) as a proxy for thinking, Hegel argues that the *cogito* statement exemplifies the thinking sublation of thought itself, that is, it exemplifies the unity of mediation with its negation: immediacy. The statement does not prove but articulates the absolute self-certainty of thinking individuality without qualification: abstract thinking *tout court*.

But thinking as subject is the thinker, and this is “I”; thinking is my inward being-at-home [*Beimirsein*], immediacy with me—it is simple knowing itself. This immediacy, however, is just the same as what is called being. Cartesius did not prove it in this way, relying as he did exclusively on consciousness. (*GeschPh* W 20:132)

To corroborate the point that “I am” is not a syllogistic conclusion—as construed by Kant in his otherwise seminal objection to Cartesianism—but rather an immediate intuition, Hegel is able to appeal to Descartes’s own words in the second Meditation as well as in his Replies to the Objections. The first of these passages quoted by Hegel reads:

This proposition [*pronunciatum*], I am, I exist, is necessarily true every time it is proffered by me or conceived in the mind . . . Here I discover: thought is [*cogitatio est*]; this alone cannot be torn from me. I am, I exist; this is certain. But for how long? Namely, for as long as I think. (*AT* 7:25 and 27)

The passage from the “Replies” is even more explicit:

And when we become aware that we are things that think, this is a primary notion which is not derived by means of any syllogism [*ex nullo syllogismo concluditur*]. When someone says “I am thinking, therefore I am, or I exist,” he does not deduce existence from thought by means of a syllogism, but recognizes it as something self-evident by a simple intuition of the mind [*simplici mentis intuitu*]. (*AT* 7:140)

Hegel highlights the significance of this argument by pointing out that in order to be a syllogism, the proposition would have to contain the universal premise “all that thinks, exists” (*GeschPh* W 20:131). But far from deriving the particular from the universal premise, Descartes derives the universal from the particular: “that major premise . . . is rather derived from the first

proposition: I think, and so I am [*Ich denke, also bin ich*]” (*GeschPh W* 20:131). The proposition “I think, and so I am,” Hegel comments further, does not presuppose a suppressed premise as would “I think therefore I am.” All that the first proposition does is “posit” the identity of thinking and being.

Even more importantly, the representational idea (*Vorstellung*) corresponding to Descartes’s concept of the first-person present tense of *cogitare* is the same as that corresponding to his concept of God, namely, a representation in which “being and thinking are inseparably connected” (*GeschPh W* 20:141)—though not on account of a syllogistic inference. The ontological argument relies on the same immediate insight, the same *simplici mentis intuitum* that discloses to the thinker her own existence. “God is” is as necessarily true as “I am.” Both statements articulate a non-discursive grasp of the identity of thinking and being. Cartesian philosophy is revolutionary because it uncovers the thinker’s self-oppositional nature, an identity of identity and difference. It articulates the concept of a thinking substance that must think itself not just as thinking activity, but equally and simultaneously as a real entity: “The great influence that Descartes had on his epoch and generally on the development of philosophy lies especially . . . in having presented thought with this its own opposition” (*GeschPh W* 20:123).

Hegel is entirely aware that these are not the explicit terms in which Descartes explicates his philosophy. But in Descartes’s epoch, philosophy was striving to erase its methodological difference from the mathematical sciences. Descartes conceives thinking, therefore, mostly in its form as understanding (see *GeschPh W* 20:124). As a thinker of the understanding, he shuns all paradox and contradiction—even when he confronts these head-on at crucial points in his work.

Cartesian metaphysics, Hegel continues, can best be grasped as grounded on four conceptual pillars, which he proceeds to summarize as follows.

(i) First, “thought must begin from itself” (*GeschPh W* 20:127)—a position taken by Hegel in the *Science of Logic*’s opening essay: “With What Must the Science Begin?” (ii) Second, the certainty of this beginning is superior to the certainty of sensation and belief—as Hegel demonstrates in the final transition from phenomenological to absolute knowing in the 1807 *Phenomenology of Spirit*.¹⁵ (iii) Third, it is possible to show how this mere certainty translates into actual true knowledge—a demand Hegel’s system is meant to satisfy through the verification (*das Bewahrheiten*) of the *Logic*’s certainties by the truths of the philosophy of the real. (iv) Lastly, God is the ground of all transition from certainty to truth—a position that no longer finds a place in Hegel’s system.

A closer look at Hegel’s discussion of these four principles helps make his non-dualistic reading of Descartes convincing; more importantly, it helps illuminate Hegel’s own qualified return to Aristotelian holism.

Since Hegel understands the history of philosophy as integral to philosophy itself,¹⁶ he proceeds by comparing and contrasting Descartes’s principles

with those of his own system. This approach, used throughout the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, allows him to assess the principles of each theory under scrutiny on the basis of their relative position in the system of philosophical sciences, where all these principles have a place.

(i) While Hegel's speculative concept of thinking enables him to develop a wide variety of categories of reality out of the thinking-being that opens the *Science of Logic*, Descartes cannot derive any content from his *cogito* because he understands it as empty form: an operational rule or an algorithm. But if *cogitare* (to think) is a mere algorithm, there cannot be sources of thought-content other than empirical ones, and that means sources drawn from psychological and scientific experience. Descartes's *de omnibus dubitandum* (everything is to be doubted) does not aim at establishing skepticism as the ultimate method for right thinking; it is rather a criterion to be overcome. The "all-engulfing doubt" that opens the second Meditation is a provisional forgetting of all presuppositions of thinking or, more precisely, it is their suspension. Hegel writes: "He began with the postponement of all presupposition [*mit Hintansetzung aller Voraussetzung*] from thinking . . . in the form of determinate, clear understanding, . . . [though] not . . . in the form of speculative reason" (*GeschPh* W 20:123–24). Descartes's provisional assumption is that a concept of pure, contentless thinking is indeed intelligible. This then engenders the intuition that the certainty of such an abstract thinking is the same as the certainty of an equally abstract being.

(ii) Descartes also claims that this abstract discovery is at once the discovery of his own (abstract) selfhood. This further step is made possible not just by the reduction of thinking to a formal operation, but also by the conflation of thinking with the thinker. Descartes's "I" is not someone's faculty of the understanding—not a subject's consciousness of the object standing over against it (*Gegenstand*)—but simple self-relation (see *GeschPh* W 20:130). What his proposition ascertains, therefore, is not certainty about something other than thought but, as Hegel's passage concludes, only absolute, empty certainty itself, knowledge reduced to self-relation: "what is certain is certainty [*das Gewisse ist die Gewissheit*]."

On the one hand, with this certainty philosophy breaks free from its previous subordination to philosophical theology; on the other hand, the price Cartesianism pays for this insubordination is its confinement to "the sphere of subjectivity" (*GeschPh* W 20:130). Content that is objective, that is, scientific, religious, or ethical content, is set aside only to be resumed later through an appeal to new presuppositions. To bolster the apodictic quality of his fundamental proposition, Descartes appeals to the self-contradictory character of its negation, that is, to the absurdity of conceiving a non-existing thinker. By citing a passage from his *Principia*, "it is indeed antagonistic [*repugnat*] to think that what thinks does not exist, all the while it thinks" (*AT* 8:7),¹⁷ Hegel emphasizes Descartes's choice of the term *repugnat* over *contradictet*. *Repugnare* literally means to fight "against the man." When he thinks thinking,

Descartes has the thinker in mind. Even so, Hegel argues, Descartes is right in claiming that being is neither an attribute nor a mode of thought but its intrinsic connotation: “The determination of being is in my ‘I’; this bond itself is the first. Thinking as being and being as thinking, this is my certainty, the ‘I’” (*GeschPh* W 20:131). If there is a weakness in Cartesian philosophy, it does not lie in this unassailable principle, but in the lack of proof for it.

(iii) While Descartes offers discursive proof of the *difference* between thought and being, he offers no proof of their *identity*, which, to Hegel, is “the most interesting idea of the modern epoch” (*GeschPh* W 20:136). Descartes simply corroborates this identity by exhibiting it as a fact of immediate intuition. The third pillar of Cartesianism consists of the fact that certainty of self is claimed to eventually translate into knowledge of the true. In discussing this principle, Hegel repeatedly uses *Seele* to refer to Descartes’s *mens* or *res cogitans*. He argues that Descartes puts forward three facts about the soul: first, that only some of its representations are accompanied by the belief in counterparts existing outside itself; second, that the soul also contains so-called inborn (in Hegel’s version, universal) concepts from which one may construct proofs; and third, that corporeal extension is not among the ideas contained in the certainty of self. This seems to leave open the possibility that the soul may exist without the body.¹⁸ In reality, however, Descartes’s reasoning merely shows that for him the difference between corporeal and incorporeal existence is only epistemic. It consists of the fact that the soul cannot think corporeity as clearly and distinctly as it can think its own immateriality.

(iv) From the Cartesian position as outlined by Hegel, it follows that the objective truth of what is other-than-soul must depend, for Descartes, upon proving the existence of a medium between the soul and its other: a third instance, the divine mediator—a representational idea that, Hegel thinks, is tacitly presupposed in the premises of the whole argument. Hence, despite Descartes’s revolutionary insight into the absolute, that is, into thought’s identity with being, the form of the argument “is somewhat crooked [*etwas schieß*]” (*GeschPh* W 20:137). For Descartes, the apodictic character of the identity of my thinking and my being is in the end only derivable from their identity in my representation of God.¹⁹

Hegel reads Cartesianism, therefore, as grounded in a metaphysics that is anything but dualistic. In this reading, Descartes asserts without deduction the inherence of being in thinking, but he can only support this tenet in a circular manner: the “non-I” is united with the “I” only through the intervention of a third, in which their identity is already presupposed (*GeschPh* W 20:145). Nonetheless, Descartes is far from embracing what Hegel calls the “rudimentary” notions of other thinkers of his time. Among the latter, Hegel may have in mind here the mathematician and astronomer Leonhard Euler’s *influxus physicus* between spirit and body, about which Euler writes, in a letter to the Princess of Brandenburg (1760): “The manner of this mutual

influence is absolutely unknown to us. We must, undoubtedly, have recourse to the omnipotence of God.”²⁰ While Descartes has a full grasp of the need to ground the self-relation of spirit in thinking alone, since he sets out from a notion of *cogitare* as the entirely formal operation of an individual thinker, he still needs a medium to fill this emptiness with content. This content is *res extensa*, the medium or “ground for the alterations of both [substances],” or God (*GeschPh* W 20:156). Hence Descartes offers a transcendent *systema assistentiae*: what the soul “cannot accomplish through its own freedom” it accomplishes through God’s intervention. It will be the task of Malebranche to develop this thought to its final consequences. Yet despite these insufficiencies, Descartes has dared to conceive the human and the divine thinker as “the perfect identity of both opposites; . . . the unity of the Idea, [or] of the Concept and reality” (*GeschPh* W 20:157).

Hylomorphism, understood as the internally differentiated identity of matter and form, is, then, the underlying truth even of the fabled dualism of Cartesian metaphysics.

4. Return to the Roots: Being-Soul

The consequences of Hegel’s integration of Aristotelian ontology into the logic of nature’s spontaneous movement toward no-longer-natural forms of actualization—that is, Hegel’s own type of dynamic hylomorphism—will become clear in the course of the discussion of specific types, functions, and activities of the soul. These consequences can be provisionally outlined here as follows.

Contrary to some medieval and early modern (and we may add, postmodern) philosophy, there is for Hegel no unintelligible relation between mere corporeity on the one hand, and incorporeal spirit on the other. Centuries of philosophical speculation have yielded accounts of the living body as the container or host of the soul, or of the soul’s attaching itself to, accompanying, migrating into, or even spreading through the body. Yet these embodiment hypotheses have been put to rest many times already, starting with Aristotle’s criticism of some of his predecessors in the first book of *De anima*. One of Aristotle’s comments, directed against arguments from Plato’s *Timaeus*, can stand here for all of them: “We note another absurdity in this doctrine as in most others: they attach the soul to, and insert it in, the body without determining for what cause this happens and what condition the body is in” (*Da* I.3 407b15–26). Nor can there be (Hegel thinks), notwithstanding the Occasionalists’ efforts, a rational account of continuous and providential divine intervention guaranteeing that the body occasions events in the mind, and the mind in the body. The twofold aspect of living organisms—their physicality and immateriality—far from being a dogmatic presupposition of the philosophy of living nature, is rather an indispensable conceptual tool in the analysis

of life. Any rational account begins from observed, familiar, perceptible phenomena and then works out, moving backwards as it were, their nonperceptual, logical implications. Once these are reached, the account may flow forward again, this time carrying with it the categories and concepts needed to transform original acquaintance (*Bekanntschaft*) with the phenomena into actual knowledge (*Erkenntnis*) of their concept. What is observed and familiar in living matter are breathing, self-moving, assimilating, reproducing, perceiving, and even imagining and thinking natural bodies, a cluster of connected activities we may call “the psyche” to distinguish them from other natural bodies that perform no such deeds.²¹ Rather than mere forms with the unintelligible capacity to dematerialize matter, these real substances are for Hegel always already units of matter and form, of *hulē* and *eidos*—only to be grasped as internally differentiated identities of opposed determinations. This use of the logical term “identity” to refer to the union of spirit and corporeity in the soul is of course not the formal logical use.²² It refers to the self-identity of individuals as organic unities in which difference does not disappear but is constantly reproduced:

The . . . in-formation [*Hineinbildung*] of the soul in its corporeity is no *absolute* one, not one that completely overcomes the difference of soul and body. Rather, it lies in the very nature of the logical Idea, as it develops everything out of itself, that this difference be rightfully preserved. Therefore, something in the body remains purely organic and hence withdrawn from the power of the soul . . . (*Enc* §412 Zus)

In Hegel’s eyes, this metaphysics of the soul finds its original formulation in Aristotle:

Let us . . . make a fresh start and try to determine what soul is and what will be its most comprehensive definition. Now there is one class of existent things which we call substance [*ousia*], including under the term, firstly, matter [*hulē*], which by itself is not this or that; secondly, shape or form [*morphē kai eidos*], by virtue of which the term “this or that” is at once applied; and thirdly, the whole from these (*to ek touton*). (*Da* II.1 412a9)

We may borrow from Kant in order to rephrase Hegel’s Aristotelian interpretation of being-soul: amorphous matter is blind, and immaterial form is empty. Though language is often treacherous (we cannot literally say what we mean: we are given to speaking of embodiment, of spirit *tout court*, of matter per se), the concept of the individual soul always denotes in the text of the *Anthropology* a singular living body—a unity of materiality and immateriality. The requisite, literally vital condition for any spiritual activity (i.e., for what contemporary philosophy prefers to call “mental states”) is a living organism.²³

This qualified identity-relation of soul and living body is, however, not just difficult to capture linguistically. The conceptual challenge is more serious. The difficulty is rooted in part in the long-standing habit of thinking of *psuchē* as “informing” the *soma* (body); or of referring to “psychosomatic” phenomena as different from what are purportedly merely psychic or merely somatic ones; or of thinking of illnesses, aptitudes, and actions as cases of a mysterious, unaccountable “interaction” between soul and body.

A further difficulty lies in the vast variety of manifestations of this identity relation in living nature. At one end of the spectrum of life, the activity of primitive organisms or souls manifests itself as predominantly mechanical or chemical, reactive self-motion. Soul is here simply a self-moving body’s response to a physical environment. But in the middle of the spectrum of living nature, the activity of animals or souls (*animae*) appears to be both reactive and purposeful motion. At the other extreme of the continuum, a human soul is a self-moving body that, while inexorably conditioned by and reactive to its environment, also acts upon this environment by deliberate manipulation.

As much as it may be necessary or useful to speak of natural spirit as “informing” the body—Aristotle himself speaks of *logoi enuloi* (*Da* I.1 403a25) and of *empsychota somata* (*Da* II.4 415b11); Hegel uses *Verleiblichung* (*Enc* §405 Zus) as well as *Hineinbildung* (*Enc* §412 Zus); and contemporary genetic theory speaks of phenotypes being “informed” by their genotype’s “code”—we must conceive this informing as an identity with the *body* insofar and as long as the body is living. And since in this hylomorphic conception physicality is as essential to the living organism as is immateriality, a soul or living individual is understood as consisting of the unceasing, lifelong tension between externality and inwardness. If one of these poles goes missing, the living individual simply ceases to exist. When this tension is recognized, it is often characterized as a dynamic relationship of form and matter in live individuals. But the logic of this tension, Hegel shows, is more complex than interactionism suggests. The living individual is not just a bond between opposites. It is the actualization of materiality’s own immateriality, or the actualization of matter’s potentiality. Hegel calls this the dynamic oneness (*Einheit*) of living individuals. As he shows in the course of the *Anthropology*, the soul in its receptive functions, that is, as irritable and sentient, is the prototype of individual totality. What is being affected and becomes sentient is the whole *logos enulos* or *verleiblichter Geist*—not just either the spiritual or the somatic moments of it. In the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Hegel claims that this speculative insight is already an integral part of Aristotle’s treatment of the living body. It is implied, for example, in *De anima*’s treatment of the unity of perceptual organs and their perception. On the physical act of seeing, for example, Aristotle writes: “Just as the eye means the pupil together with the eyesight, so the soul and body together constitute the animal” (*Da* II.1 413a1–2).

For Hegel, therefore, Aristotle's theory of human perception is already speculative in nature:

When we ask, what is the substance of the eye, it is the nerves, the humors, the tissues that we mean; but Aristotle says, to the contrary, that seeing itself is substance, while those are only empty names . . . Substance is active form; the *hulē* is only a potency, not real substance. This is a truly speculative concept. (*GeschPh* W 19:201–2)

In the *Anthropology*'s reconstruction of the logic of being-soul, it is precisely the unsustainable tension between the soul's polarity and the soul's oneness that prompts its self-induced metamorphoses from sentience to self-feeling to the intellectual overgrasping²⁴ and practical command over its body. And in the forms of spirit treated in the *Encyclopaedia* "Phenomenology" and "Psychology," the tension between spirit's enduring identity on the one hand, and the contradiction between this identity and its self-differentiation on the other, emerges as the dialectic of consciousness and of the "I."

To wit, the soul, insofar as it is subjectivity or selfness [*Selbstischkeit*],²⁵ is already *in itself* the "I." But to the *actual* "I" belongs more than the *immediate, natural* subjectivity of the soul, because the "I" is this universal, this simplicity that only truly exists when it has itself for object . . . In external nature . . . the universal . . . does not attain *actual being-for-self* . . . This potentiality becomes actuality only in the "I." . . . The "I" is the *lightning* that strikes through the natural soul and consumes its naturalness. (*Enc* §412 Zus)

In one of the Additions to the *Encyclopaedia* "Phenomenology" that forms the sequel to the *Anthropology* (*PhS Enc* §422 Zus), this point is made to hold in the much larger context of the philosophy of reality as a whole.

Already in nonliving systems, Hegel argues in this Addition, the understanding discovers what only reason can grasp, and that is, that the law of motion of mechanical and physical systems expresses a unity of opposed determinations. The law regulating the solar system, for example, formulates "the *indissoluble unit*" or "*necessary inward connection*" of entirely different dimensions of the system. The reference here is to the solar system's temporal and spatial features: the everlasting and necessary relation between the square of the planets' orbital periods and the cube of their distance from the Sun. Scientific understanding discovers this unity to be the case; dialectical reason can explain it, because it can explain the law of planetary motion as an identity of differences.

In the wholly different context of objective spirit—the sphere of Right—the idea of law that grounds the system we call the state-of-right (*Rechtsstaat*, *état de droit*) connects in an indissoluble manner wrong and right in their real

existence as crime and punishment. To the superficial observer, punishment might appear to be a wrong perpetrated by the state against an individual. But dialectical reason can prove that punishment lies in the very concept of crime. The legitimate state consists of the permanent righting of wrong, the continuous activity of rebalancing opposite forces. The state-of-right is the unity of wrong and right.

The essence of the law, whether referred to external nature or to the ethical order of the world, consists of the *indissoluble unity*, a *necessary inward connection of different* determinations. Thus . . . in the concept of crime lies essentially its opposite, punishment. In the same way . . . the law of the motion of the planets . . . must be grasped as an inner necessary unity of different determinations. (*PhS Enc* §422 Zus)

The logic of living systems exhibits the objective character of this dialectic in a more obvious, palpable way. To perception as much as to the understanding, a living thing appears to be the incessant unification or holding together of unity and difference—of a living center and its articulations. The representation of simultaneous oneness and inner multiplicity is formulated by Hegel twice (in the *Encyclopaedia* “Phenomenology”) as a difference of what does not differ. The first formulation is abstractly logical: “What inner difference consists of . . . in its truth is difference onto itself or *the difference that is none*” (*PhS Enc* §423). The second formulation pertains to how this logic expresses itself in the teleology of living nature:

In *what is living* . . . consciousness beholds the very *process* of the positing and sublation of different determinations; it perceives that the difference is *no* difference, i.e., no absolutely fixed difference. Indeed, life is that inwardness that . . . flows completely into its *externalization*; it is . . . a *sensible, exterior*, and at once utterly *inward* existence, a *material something* in which the *mutual externality* of the parts appears *sublated*, the singular appears reduced to . . . a *moment*, a *member* of the whole. In short, life must be grasped as end-to-itself [*Selbstzweck*]. (*PhS Enc* §423 Zus)

This unity of the living thing can be articulated in an abstract way in the categories of the *Logic*. The organism may be said to instantiate the dialectic of essence and appearance, whose concise formulation in the “Doctrine of Essence” of the *Encyclopedia Logic* reads as follows: “What is inward, is also present externally and *vice versa*; the appearance shows nothing that is not in the essence, and there is nothing in the essence that is not manifest” (*L Enc W* 8, §139). This could count as the most terse (and most abstract) formulation of the overall goal of the *Anthropology*: through observation, description,

and logical analysis, the treatise aims at capturing the extraordinary chain of events by which nature overcomes its own self-externality through an inward turn: the self-sublation of nature over against itself—as announced in §388.

Since nature is the realm of exteriority par excellence, where space and time encase every event, one would not expect any of its subsystems to radically escape this framework and set itself apart from the whole. How could the spatially and temporally existing Idea, galactic systems and earthly cycles, plant and animal speciation, mechanical motions and chemical affinities allow for a reality unconstrained by physical laws? How can there be points in nature where mechanism or chemical bonding give way to felt sensation, imagery, or thought? What paths are there on which atomic and subatomic events become meanings?

These questions include the central query of the *Anthropology*: how can the being of nature countenance the existence of the soul?

Classical philosophy endeavors to account for what is real, for *Realität*. The conjunction of the real with its concept is, in Hegel's terminology, actuality: *Wirklichkeit*. By grounding his philosophy of the real in the science of thinking the real (the *Science of Logic*), Hegel aims to provide a coherent explanation of the actual. The *Anthropology*, together with the *Philosophy of Nature* and the subsequent parts of the *Philosophy of Spirit*, is an integral component of this philosophy of the real. Its main subject matters are Earth's self-moving, self-reproducing, metabolizing, sensing and feeling, imagining, desiring, thinking, and dying organisms. It belongs to this subject matter that some organisms are not only effects and causes of natural processes, but originators of unnatural and indeed antinatural activities as well. Not only do physical events set the nervous system in motion, but mind does the same. Not only does mind harbor feelings, images, or thoughts in itself; it can also detect them in the countenance, the voice, the language, and the actions of others. Finite spirit carries, as it were, meaning and intention on its face.

The *Anthropology* discusses the many facets of these connections of finite minds with their own and other bodies under the heading "The feeling soul in its immediacy" (§§405–6). Some of these connections are immediate (preconscious, noncausally transmitted, sometimes referred to by Hegel as "magic").²⁶ Such, for example, is the link of the mind with its dreams, of the fetus with the mother, of the conscious individual to its innermost character or *Genius*. Other connections are mediated: they are gestural, linguistic, practical relations. It will be the task of the *Objective Spirit* section of the *Encyclopaedia* to show that finite spirit acting in the world proves "this little agitation of the brain which we call thought"²⁷ to be rather a storm of the mind and a gargantuan upheaval of what there is.

Hegel's treatise on the becoming of *anthropos* is one of several attempts in modern philosophy to capture the shadowy nature of soul's agency, but it is the most detailed and comprehensive philosophical account of living individuality. Once transcendent agency could no longer be invoked in the

metaphysics of nature, modern philosophy came to rely on its own resources and those of the natural sciences for providing explanations of the most double-sided of realities, one that is manifestly material and immaterial. This is the reason for Hegel's repeated references to the human soul in its various conditions as a "double." We shall see in the third section of chapter 7 that he refers, for example, to the individual feeling soul as an amphibious "double" (*ein Zwiefaches*; *Enc* §405 Zus and §406 Zus), and to the deranged soul as "an actual double" (*ein wirklich Zwiefaches*; *Enc* §408 Zus). The latter phrase refers not just to the double aspect of every human individuality, but to the split individuality of one who is actually "falling apart into *two personalities*" (*Enc* §408 Zus). At every step of the argument's unfolding, while Hegel employs the distinction between living body and spirit for purposes of analysis, his implicit reference is to their (difference-entailing) identity, the soul.

With these specifications in mind, we are ready to grasp the subject matter of the *Anthropology* in Hegel's own terms: the next two chapters detail the principal ways in which he identifies and explains the first stirrings and the primary activities of spirit "still captive in nature" (*PhS Enc* §387 Zus).

Chapter 2



Life, or *die Weltseele*

Spirit does not emerge from nature in a natural way. . . . The emergence of spirit is not of the flesh, but spiritual.

—Hegel, *Enc* §381 Zus

1. Nature Exceeds Itself

Student records of the introduction to the lectures on the *Philosophy of Nature* report that Hegel characterizes nature as an enigma whose elusive solution at once fascinates and repels us:

We face nature as a riddle and a problem, one that we feel the urge to resolve as much as we are repulsed by it: we are attracted, [because] spirit presages itself in it; repulsed, [as by] an alien existence in which spirit does not find itself. This is why Aristotle says that philosophy began from wonderment. (*PhN Enc*, 12).¹

Through the analysis of organic individuality, of species-being (the “*simple essence of the species*,” as it is called in *PhenG* W 3:224) and of the logical necessity of individual death (as argued in the *Philosophy of Nature*), Hegel has shown that life entails more than a combination of physical and chemical elements. This necessary excess is explained in the two closing sections of the *Philosophy of Nature* as follows:

The animal’s . . . inadequacy to [its species’] universality is its *original disease* and inborn *seed of death*. The abrogation² of this inadequacy is itself the implementation of this destiny. (*PhN Enc* §375)

This abrogation . . . is only . . . the *death of what is natural*. Subjectivity, however, is, in the Idea of life, the Concept . . . ; through this . . . abrogation . . . the last *externality* of nature is sublated, and the Concept . . . has become *for itself*. With this, nature has passed

over into its truth, the subjectivity of the Concept, whose *objectivity* is . . . *concrete universality* . . . [or] the Concept that has the Concept for its existence—*spirit*. (*PhN Enc* §376)

These passages encapsulate the fundamental understanding of natural and spiritual reality on Hegel's part. Nature and spirit are two modes in which the same logos or Concept exists or is there (*Dasein*). The first physical mode may be called the objectivity of the Concept. This manner of being fails to live up to the completeness of which the Concept is capable—it fails to actualize all its potentialities. In this sense, nature is real but “untrue.” The second mode may be called the subjectivity of the Concept: it consists of self-referentiality, a relation of the Concept to its own objective mode. This is the real and also true actualization of the Concept. It provides the most general, and abstract, definition of spirit per se.

The first sentence of the *Anthropology* now simply recapitulates the result of the study of life in “Organic Physics,” the third and last part of the *Philosophy of Nature*: “Spirit has *become* as the truth of nature” (*Enc* §388).

According to the principle *ex nihilo nihil fit*, spirit can only emerge from nature if the latter contains it potentially. Spirit does not soar like battle-ready Athena from nature's fractured skull. Nor is it a separate *pneuma*, a natural or divine breath imparted to a shape of clay. The referent here is neither consciousness nor self-consciousness. The all-important distinction between natural spirit and conscious spirit is already explained in the “Preliminaries” to the *Encyclopaedia Logic*: “It is not nature that brings the *noûs* to its own consciousness; only the human being replicates itself in such a way as to make the universal be *for* the universal” (*L Enc* §24 Zus 1). By contrast, the movement of natural spirit is constrained by particularity. Its inception is best illustrated by the self-motion of the dull, unicellular zygote that, seized by a shudder, divides itself—through *Ur-teilung*—and becomes a twofold unity.

In the *Anthropology* Hegel often uses the logical term *Urteil* (“judgment” or “proposition”), derived from *Ur-teilung* or original partition, to name what in his eyes constitutes the fundamental relationship of nature and spirit. In the opening section quoted above he writes that nature's “becoming or transitioning into the Concept has the more specific meaning of a *free judgment* [*Bedeutung des freien Urteils*]” (*Enc* §388). Ten sections later, while explaining the difference between a living singularity existing in-itself and a living individual existing also for-itself, he refers to the transition from the one to the other as an “*immediate judgment* . . . the *awakening* of the soul” (*Enc* §398). Even the physiological act of awakening is repeatedly referred to as a judgment: “we have been able to call the awakening a *judgment* of the individual soul . . . because this condition brings about a *division* of the soul in one that is for itself, and one that only is” (*Enc* §399 Zus). And in the subsequent treatment of the feeling soul that is still unconscious of objectivity

(a treatment of “spirit for itself at the stage of its darkness,” *Enc* §404 Anm), Hegel again refers to this condition as an *Urteil* in which the division is still only internal to the soul itself, and not yet a differentiation between itself and externality. The feeling soul is a state in which the individual begins to distinguish itself from its corporeal substance and begins to relate to it as being its own.³

Hegel’s recurrent use of *Urteil* to describe fundamental organic processes as well as spiritual ones is not as capricious as it seems. It was also rather *en vogue* in contemporaneous philosophical, naturalistic, and even poetic contexts. Friedrich Hölderlin’s work entitled *Urtheil und Seyn*⁴ is perhaps the most famous testament to the epoch’s organicistic enthrallment with original diremptions. J. W. von Goethe’s morphological studies, however, are even more illuminating with regard to Hegel’s theory of nature’s and natural spirit’s spontaneous diremptions from an original unit—which both thinkers call “the Idea.” The next section outlines Goethe’s ever-developing understanding of natural phenomena and their original diremptions with the aim of clarifying, by comparison and contrast, Hegel’s own use of these notions.

2. Goethe’s *Urphänomen*

It is not widely known that Goethe’s scientific research and writings surpass, in quantitative terms, his poetic production. A brief psychobiography of Goethe⁵ once described nine-year cycles in his life, with periods of “renewed adolescence” recurring in the last two years of each cycle and ostensibly corresponding to climaxes in Goethe’s artistic creativity. In the long times between these most creative periods, Goethe dedicated himself to statesmanship and to natural science. His non-Newtonian theory of colors is his best known and most controversial scientific contribution, although it has been repeatedly noted that the famous opposition between Newton’s and Goethe’s theories of color is more apparent than substantial: in these interpretations, Newton’s physicomathematical explanation would be entirely compatible with Goethe’s “phenomenological” account.⁶ Goethe’s main interest, however, lay in the area of biological research which he called “morphology.” This he defined as a “theory of the formation and transformation [*Bildung und Umbildung*] of organic bodies” (Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke* [abbr. SW] 24:399). As the word “morphology” itself suggests, Goethe’s thinking owes some of its fundamental elements to his reading of the first theoreticians of form in Western thought, Plato and Aristotle. Not being too concerned about the systematic accuracy of his philosophical references, Goethe tends to make free use of the terminology of both philosophers in his own theorizing about natural processes such as metamorphosis, polarity, shaping, and speciation. Commentators find it difficult to determine whether the character of Goethe’s presuppositions is prevalently Platonic or Aristotelian.⁷

More importantly, Goethe's views developed over time, starting out from a kind of naive Platonism, which assumes the fixity of the forms of natural kinds, and eventuating into an idealistically oriented form of Aristotelianism. To complicate the picture, at the beginning of his natural studies Goethe interpreted his own Platonizing conception of forms in ways very close to eighteenth-century French materialism, which conceived the unchangeable forms as actual models found in nature.

The evolution of Goethe's thinking is especially evident in his doctrine of the archetypal phenomena of living matters, or *Urphänomene*. He initially conceives these as a plurality of entities, primitive natural blueprints of the types found in the organic world. Later on, however, he winds up referring to a single universal archetypal phenomenon—*das Urphänomen*—as “the Idea,” defined as an imperceptible, inward form connecting all organisms and all species to one another in the continuum that is living nature. One can readily see that much of Goethe's and his contemporaries' notion of a universal, biologically built-in “form” of life adumbrates later scientific notions of genetic “information.” One may also argue, of course, that the notion is mutatis mutandis already implicit in Aristotle's concept of the *eidos* informing the matter of living bodies.⁸ In Goethe's case, four years before his death, despite having long since become aware that the archetypal phenomenon must be a concept and not a real entity, he was still grappling with his old unworkable notion of a plurality of archetypes: “It is a real misfortune to be haunted and tempted by so many ghosts! This morning . . . the old quirk came into my head again whether I couldn't discover . . . the archetypal plant” (Goethe, *SW* 15:285–86).

Goethe's morphological theory cannot be dismissed as a dramaturge's “quirky” grappling with science in his spare time. It is rather a peculiar, unsystematic brand of phenomenology that can be extracted from his several essays on cognition and science.⁹ Its roots reach back to Aristotle's philosophical-biological works; its most immediate medium is the natural philosophy of Schelling; and its unacknowledged ideal is Hegel's philosophy of nature.

Goethe's philosophy is eclectic, and its immediate sources are neither Plato's nor Aristotle's extant texts—though he was acquainted with both—but rather the Platonism and Aristotelianism of Renaissance thinkers like Giordano Bruno and of modern thinkers like Spinoza, Leibniz, Kant, and Goethe's own contemporaries. Despite this eclecticism, Goethe's evolving insight into the *Urphänomen* of living nature is highly valuable for an understanding of Hegel's primary diremption or *Urteil* of natural spirit.

Goethe's science is phenomenological in a broad sense. A phenomenon, he writes, is anything that presents itself to us unconditionally. A phenomenon is the groundless ground of common experience, “a consequent without antecedent, an effect without a cause” for us (*SW* 13:76).¹⁰ Phenomena are also the unconditional beginning of all experimental science. Their givenness

makes them into the absolute starting point for the scientist. When conceived in this way, the singular concept of “phenomenon” is elevated to the role of highest genus of all particular phenomena so that, in a way reminiscent of Aristotle’s being, no other genus can be given under which this concept may be subsumed. In Goethe’s acceptance, therefore, the referent of this highest concept, that is, the phenomenon-as-such, cannot be formally defined (since that would require a higher genus and a *differentia specifica*) but only described.

In the investigation of living things, this phenomenal immediacy belongs to the many perceivable self-motions and actions of organisms—just as described by Aristotle:

We take, then, as our starting point . . . that it is life that distinguishes the animate from the inanimate. But the term life is used in different senses . . . thus there is intelligence, sensation, locomotion and rest, motion concerned with nutrition, and decay and growth. (*Da* II.2 413a20–25)

According to Goethe, all these types of motion by themselves imply that organisms are driven by forms they carry in themselves. And since they all evidently aim at the preservation and endurance of individuals and their species, these inward forms must be grasped as entelechistic. Accordingly, any existent can be called “organic” if it carries this formal principle of self-realization in itself. The fundamental *raison d’être* of living beings is none other than that indicated by Aristotle, namely, the preservation of their own kind through reproduction. At the lower ranks of life, this end is performed by parthenogenesis; at higher levels, it requires the involvement of opposites: “Whenever we perceive this capacity as divided, we describe it with the names of the two sexes” (*SW* 13:179). For once, Aristotle’s formulation of the same principle is more poetical than Goethe’s: the reproduction of living creatures happens “in order that they may, so far as they can, share in the eternal and the divine” (*Da* II.4 415b; full quote below).

But givenness and immediacy are not all that characterize Goethe’s approach to the scientific study of living nature. His key concepts of archetypal plant (*Urpflanze*) and archetypal animal (*Urthier*) (*SW* 24:404ff.) undergo a radical change in ontological status over the course of three decades, starting from his research in Italian botanical gardens (1786–88) and ending with his reflections on this same journey written thirty years later (1828–29). Throughout his evolution, Goethe holds onto the notion that the morphologist’s main task is to discover the original models of all presently observable natural organisms. While Linnaeus’s *Systema Naturae*¹¹ had mostly relied on external features for classification, the morphologist’s concern is with the innermost forms of living beings. Despite the name, in other words, the morphologist is no longer intent upon discovering shapes, but ideas.

The centrality of this view in Goethe's thinking is such that it even plays an important role in his dramatic production. In *Faust*, Mephistopheles sarcastically emphasizes the contrast between the chemical investigation and the morphological study of life—a passage which Hegel quotes approvingly in the *Philosophy of Nature*: “Whoever will know a live thing and expound it, / First kills out the spirit it had when he found it, / And then the parts are all in his hand, / Minus only the spiritual band. / *Encheiresin naturae* is chemistry's name / Mocking herself in unwitting shame” (*Faust* I, lines 1936–41;¹² quoted in *PhN Enc* §246 Zus). And it is, again, Mephistopheles who makes the Satanic promise that the original matrixes (the “mothers”) of nature will be disclosed to those getting hold of the right code: “Here, take this key! / . . . / How much 'tis worth, thou soon shalt understand. / The key will scent the true place from all others: / Follow it down!—'twill lead thee to the Mothers” (*Faust* II, lines 6259–65).¹³

As seen above, in the earlier phase of his morphological studies Goethe thought of these essential forms of all organisms as being themselves primitive organisms. During his early Italian journey he relied heavily on Buffon's preformism-inspired work¹⁴ with its notions of primitive and general design (*dessin primitif et général*), of “original structure” and “internal model.” In the *Italian Journal* of his later years Goethe admits to having actively searched for the archetypal plant in the botanical gardens of Padova and Palermo. In a letter from June 8, 1787, perhaps already betraying uncertainty with regard to the ontological status of this plant-like archetype, Goethe had stressed its “dynamic” character. With the reckless enthusiasm of a Faust who has fully internalized his Mephistopheles (or perhaps with the hubris of a twenty-first-century geneticist), Goethe writes: “I am closing in on the secret of plant reproduction . . . The archetypal plant will be the most amazing creature . . . for which nature itself will . . . envy me . . . With this model and the key to it, we may invent plants to infinity, which, even if they don't exist, still could exist and . . . have inward truth and necessity” (SW 3:305).

Soon enough, however, Goethe became aware of the logical and ontological opacity of his appeals to “models” and “keys” in a scientific context. In his preparatory writings for a planned work on morphology that never saw the light of day¹⁵ he describes ontogenesis and phylogenesis as transformations taking place on “a spiritual ladder, as it were” (SW 24:349). In the same passage, he refers to the selfsame ground underlying these transformations as “identical organ,” “archetypal body [*Urkörper*],” and finally as “internal identity.” He distinguishes, without separating them, the material causes of life and the soul-like cause that enables organisms' permanence through change. Even the “spiritual ladder” on which individuals and species are said to develop and evolve is strongly reminiscent of Aristotle's psychic hierarchy from nutritive-reproductive to perceptive, imagining, thinking, and self-thinking soul—all rooted in the first *archē* of life described in the second book of *De anima* with the words:

For it is the most natural function in all living things . . . to reproduce their species . . . animal producing animal and plant, plant, in order that they may, so far as they can, share in the eternal and the divine. For it is that which all things yearn after, and that is the final cause of their natural activity. (*Da* II.4 415a29–415b)

It was in 1794 that Goethe's reification of the concept of archetype was radically shaken by a conversation with his friend Friedrich Schiller. Having drawn for Schiller a likeness of the *Urpflanze*, Goethe is startled and at first irked by the reaction of his friend who, shaking his head, puts him right: "This is not the content of an experience; this is an idea." (Goethe reports the conversation in his 1817 memoir "Happy Event," SW 24:437.)

Not four years after the incident, Goethe's writings on plant and animal metamorphosis begin to refer to archetypes in unmistakably idealistic terms: *Urphänomene* are now *Urbilder*, archetypal images; and the concept of *Urphänomen* is said to denote a "hidden law," an "inward force," an "internal spirit," and even "the highest thought" of which nature is capable (SW 24:420ff.). Forty years after the Italian journey, Goethe has come to recognize that what he had been searching for could have been neither a plant nor an animal—no matter how simple and ubiquitous—but had to have been all along the concept of planthood and the concept of animality. In the same sense in which Hegel's "soul" is not an other to the living body, but rather its concept, so for Goethe the archetypal plant has eventually become the concept of plant life. In 1829, the octogenarian poet takes to calling physical archetypes "old quirks" and "ghosts." He has left behind the familiar grounds of eighteenth-century materialism and has alighted onto the territory of Hegel's philosophy of living nature.

A Hegelian interpretation of archetypal phenomena is already operative, if only implicitly, in Goethe's already mentioned preparatory works on morphology, some of which date to the early 1790s. From his discovery of the ideality of inward formal causes onward, identity-in-difference becomes for Goethe the dominant connotation of the *Urphänomen*. He first defines morphology as a general theory of the dynamism that is specific to all living nature. The subject matter of morphology is not empirical phenomena per se but their metamorphoses. In the introduction to his planned work on morphology, he redefines the term *Gestalt*, whose common usage evokes a static structure or fixed shape. He defines the observable *Gestalten* of living nature as characterized by continuous transformations brought about by self-division and self-multiplication. In morphological theory, Goethe claims, *Gestalt* must be used to mean "the idea, the concept" of lawful change: "From the first physical and chemical elements to the spiritual expression of human beings . . . *Gestalt* is something in motion, a becoming, a passing away . . . The theory of metamorphosis is the key to all manifestations of nature" (SW 24:349). Though it is a theory of forms, therefore, morphology

is not a doctrine of nature's imperfect participation in unchanging forms after a Platonic fashion.¹⁶ It is rather a theory of nature's own motional patterns. Strictly speaking, morphology is not a doctrine of forms (*Gestaltenlehre*) but rather a doctrine of the change of forms (*Verwandlungslehre*). Since patterns themselves are forms, patterns of transformation are forms of forms. In order to explain how changeability and self-sameness are simultaneous and compatible in live organisms, the conceptual apparatus of the morphologist must allow for different semantic levels in its use of the term "phenomenon."

In his 1798 writings on physics, Goethe distinguishes three such meanings. Though he applies them to all the branches of natural science, we shall focus here on their distinctions as they pertain to the life sciences alone.

(i) Goethe calls "empirical phenomena" objects that common experience identifies as living. Their specificity is anchored in their relation to the observer: they are objects of perception, of desire, of aesthetic contemplation, of worship, of fear. (ii) He calls "scientific phenomena" those objects experienced under controlled conditions and after a planned fashion. Their specificity lies in their objective relation to other phenomena: they are effects, causes, progeny, progenitors, and so on. (iii) The third notion is that of "pure phenomena." These are neither met with nor observed. They are conceived. As if following a German idealism handbook, Goethe defines "pure phenomena" as the contents of a conceptual unity of subjective certainty and objective truth, that is, of subjective experience and scientific observation. In cognizing pure phenomena, he writes, one reaches

the point where the human spirit comes closest to the objects in their universality . . . and merges with them in a rational manner . . . [a point] where both the sameness and variability of all phenomena are intuited and taken in, [first] recognized in their own determinacy, and [then] determined anew through the human spirit. (SW 25:126)

The subjectivity of the singular phenomena of common experience and the objectivity of the corresponding particular phenomena of scientific knowledge merge here in the Goethean notion of universal or pure phenomena: we start out from the perceptions and sensible intuitions of quotidian experience and then proceed by degrees (on a "spiritual ladder, as it were") to abstract reasoning and scientific generalization. This enables our grasp of the so-called pure phenomena that are the ultimate ground of common as well as scientific experience.

For Goethe, pure phenomena are the so-called archetypes of nature, to which he also refers as "the ideas." And just like that of Hegel, Goethe's concept of the idea is very much indebted to the Aristotelian notion of *entelecheia*, the phenomenally last but logically first principle of any organic development. The most unreflected recognition of an object as being alive is predicated upon a spontaneous readiness to accept sameness in unison

with change. On this as well, Goethe shares Hegel's view that the claim traditionally attributed to Aristotle—*nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit in sensu*—must be completed by its converse, *nihil est in sensu quod non fuerit in intellectu*, in order to do full justice to Aristotle's thought.¹⁷

Goethe now seems to think of "metamorphosis" as a conceptual device by which he can eliminate the last traces of Platonism lurking in his notion of pure archetypes. He now understands the latter no longer as real entities but as principles of prototypical transformations (lawful changes) of living nature. *Urphänomene* are therefore nature's own *logoi* of change. They are, in other words, ideas: "the idea in the appearances . . . contradicts the senses . . . The Copernican system is founded on an idea . . . which still daily contradicts our senses . . . The metamorphosis of plants contradicts the senses likewise" (SW 13:257).

In a manner not unfamiliar to the reader of Hegel, Goethe's archetypal ideas are for him contents of *conceptually mediated* intuitions. For Goethe, they bridge the gap between quantitative, reductionist accounts and qualitative, holistic explanations of life. While physics and chemistry provide the dynamic causes (*Ursachen*), morphology discloses the dynamic forms (*Urformen*) of the same phenomenon. The two are complementary:

Only in the highest and most universal [thought], idea and appearance join together; in observation and experience, they are separate. The highest [thought] consists of the intuiting [*das Anschauen*] of the different as identical; the most universal [thought] is the . . . active unification of what is separate into an identity. (SW 13:191)

Goethe, however, still struggles with the problem of using "idea" and "archetype" in their plural forms: though these notions allow for a nonreductionist explanation of life, in view of the unity of living nature (and of the very meaning of *archē*), how can there be more than one idea or archetype? Thus, Goethe corrects himself: "The Idea is eternal and singular; whenever we use this term in the plural we are incorrect" (SW 13:124). A plurality of archetypes threatens to once more confine the subject matter of morphology to an early Platonic world of multiple unchanging realities. To resolve this impasse, Goethe finally formulates the idea of a singular and universal *Urphänomen* as the only adequate explication of metamorphosis. And although as *summum archetypum* this Idea is also the model for all particular prototypes, and thus reminiscent of Plato's form of forms, Goethe prefers to think of it in an Aristotelian manner, namely, as form that only exists in organic nature.

In the attempt to wring the *Urphänomen* from Platonizing metaphysics, Goethe's formulations become virtually indistinguishable from Hegel's. He speaks of empirical science as being one-sidedly true: "Those who extol experience alone . . . do not realize that experience is only half of experience" (SW

13:388), and he insists on distinguishing between the real Idea, mental concepts, and the concept of the Idea, for a full grasp of the notion of archetype: “All things we become aware of and can speak of are manifestations of the Idea; concepts are what we utter, and the Idea itself is a concept [only] insofar as we speak of it” (SW 13:124).

The morphologist’s awareness of change in what he recognizes as self-identical enables the discovery of patterns of metamorphosis. These patterns play in morphology the role played by equations in Newton’s physics. Though it conflicts with the understanding, metamorphosis is ubiquitous in everyday and scientific experience. Metamorphic patterns are the hidden laws of nature through which pure phenomena appear to us in the protean *Gestalten* of life. The concept of metamorphosis itself as the supreme archetype of nature is “what is called Idea, namely that which forever steps into the world of appearances and therefore meets us as a law of all appearances” (SW 13:82).

Goethe insists that the concept of archetype plays a decisive cognitive role in the practical development of the life sciences. The notion of a plant archetype, for example, makes it possible to identify root, stem, or leaf despite the nearly infinite variety of their physical manifestations. The same applies to the scientific identification of animals: “As I had previously searched for the archetypal plant I now attempted to find the archetypal animal, but this means, in the end: the concept, the idea of animal” (SW 24:16).

Despite his terminological uncertainties and conceptual eclecticism, for Goethe, living phenomena result from the original self-division of the *Urphänomen* in a way not dissimilar to that in which all subject matters of Hegel’s *Philosophy of Nature* result from the original self-diremption of the Idea. In either of these theoretical perspectives, idea and phenomenon are conceptually distinguishable but not separable. Goethe’s phenomena are not additional to the *Urphänomen*, nor is Hegel’s nature supervenient to the Idea. Rather, the existence and truth of Goethe’s *Urphänomen* is proven by the actual existence of species and their individuals, just as the immediate mode of existence of Hegel’s logical Idea is proven—the term is *bewahrheitet*—by the actual existence of the lawful phenomena of nature.

One finds this latter conception spelled out in summary form in the final two sections of Hegel’s *Encyclopaedia Logic*, which are also introductory to the *Philosophy of Nature*. The *Encyclopaedia Logic* closes with the explication of the concept of the Concept or, in an equivalent formulation, with the “pure Idea for which the Idea exists” (*L Enc* §243). This self-relation of the Idea is nonmediated, that is, it is an intuiting of the Idea by the Idea itself. This intuiting translates ontologically into the immediate form of existence of nature. The famous formulation of the last section of the *Encyclopaedia Logic*, according to which the Idea “freely releases” the otherness and particularity that inhere in it, thus “resolving” itself as nature (*L Enc* §244), is followed by this sober Addition:

We have now returned to the concept of the Idea with which we began. That with which we began was being, abstract being, and now we have the *Idea* as *being*; this existing Idea is, however, *nature*. (*L Enc* §244 Zus)

3. Hegel's *Urteil*

Hegel's own employment of the word *Urteil* in the ways outlined in the first section of this chapter loses its eccentric flavor as soon as it is placed in the scientific and epistemic context illustrated by the just-portrayed studies by Goethe. For Hegel, our comprehension of nature depends in general on the possibility of conceptualizing its phenomena and capturing its laws in formulas, equations, or judgments. These judgments and the concepts they articulate must, on the one hand, accord with the rules of formal logic (non-contradiction, excluded middle, and so on); on the other hand, they must be justifiable as parts of the broader systematic account they serve. This implies that they must also be subsumable under the categories of speculative logic—not least those expounded in the “Doctrine of the Concept.” These are not only *categories of subjectivity* without qualification, such as “concept,” “judgment,” and “syllogism,” but also *subjective categories of objectivity* such as “mechanism,” “chemism,” “teleology,” and “life.”¹⁸ For Hegel's account of the phenomena of life and psyche that is at issue here, this systematic requirement has the following consequences.

Logical reflection on the categorical judgment (“S is P”) shows that it expresses neither just the application of a mere concept P to an unrelated subject matter S, nor just a relation of containment of a subject matter S in the concept P. The categorical judgment claims rather, through the copula, that S and P are identical (in spatial terms, they overlap) notwithstanding their difference: “Of course, the determinations of singularity and universality, subject and predicate, are also different, but beyond this the very general *fact* remains that every judgment expresses them as identical” (*L Enc* §166 Anm). This kind of judgment does not simply connect a subject “out there” with a predicate “located in our head” (*L Enc* §166 Zus). Its work consists of making explicit, through the universal predicate, the conceptual content already implicit in the subject. The judgment simply spells out this identity. Borrowing from Newtonian physics' term “momentum” (in physical systems, the vector representing the combined product of mass and velocity of every particle), Hegel explains that being singular, being particular, and being universal are inextricable “moments” of the subject in a categorical judgment. Their intimate connection is signified by the copula. The subject names a *singular* being that is what it is only as a *particular* instantiation of the *universality* named by the predicate. For good reasons, the judgment states this identity in terms of being and not of having: the singular subject is not just

said to possess, but to be the universal predicate. The notion of universality (*Allgemeinheit*) differs here of course from that of commonality (*Gemeinsamkeit*): the universal expressed by the predicate is the essence of the subject in the proposition, not merely a feature this subject shares with others.¹⁹ Socrates, for example, does not just have humanity as a predicate alongside shortness or snub-nosedness. He is nothing if not human. Hence the categorical judgment “Socrates is human” states that this individual is, in an essential and objective respect, identical with or sublated within a universality. Aside from the *Encyclopaedia Logic*’s prosaic but no doubt compelling illustration of this point: “Take away animality from the dog, and it becomes impossible to say what it is” (*L Enc* §24 Zus 1), other examples come to mind: “Allah is great” or “God is mind” differ substantially from “Allah has greatness” or “God has mind”; and “Hegel’s logic is speculative” differs from “Hegel’s logic has speculative features.”

The fact that in these judgments the universal predicate provides the essence, *Wesen*, or “what it is to be”²⁰ of the subject term prompts Hegel’s famous claim of the identity of speculative logic and metaphysics: “Thus *logic* coincides with *metaphysics*, with the science of *things* grasped in *thoughts* that used to be taken to express the *essentialities* [*die Wesenheiten*] of the *things*” (*L Enc* §24). While in formal logical contexts no necessary connection exists between concepts’ semantic content and the judgments in which they are embedded, by contrast, in the theoretical part of the sciences, in the science of logic, and in the speculative philosophy of the real, the connection is vital.

For Hegel, furthermore, the just elucidated peculiarities of the categorical judgment apply generally to the principles (*Grundbegriffe*) of all the sciences. He argues that these have a semantic content that ultimately determines, by the application of appropriate procedures, the meaning and truth value of all the particular concepts and propositions that derive from them.

One finds in the *Encyclopaedia Logic* a plain but persuasive illustration of this point. In the science of jurisprudence, we read in the “Doctrine of the Concept,”

we do speak of the “deduction” of a content from its concept, for instance, of the deduction of legal determinations pertaining to property from the concept of property . . . This involves the recognition that the concept is not merely a form . . . without any content of its own. (*L Enc* §160 Zus)

In other words, and by way of illustration of the logical point, the juridical notions of, say, “alienability” or “theft” are not supplementary to the notion of “private property.” They are not attached to it on the basis of juridical intuition or legal history. The judgments “theft is a crime” and “private property is only alienable by the owner” do not establish formal connections between

a singular subject and a contingent predicate. Rather, those predicates are intrinsic to the foundational concept of private property; the concept, that is, of a kind of possession depriving all others from access. The philosophy of jurisprudence can only explain the criminal nature of theft, or justify an absolute right to the alienation of one's possessions, by recourse to this concept of private property, from which alone the further concepts of alienability and theft derive their meaning.²¹

The same reasoning applies to the categories of speculative logic whose semantic content determines the meaning and explanatory power of key concepts of the philosophy of the real, as well as of the notions derived from them. In the *Philosophy of Nature*, "organism" is just such a notion. It differs from "combination," "aggregate," and "mechanism" in that it refers to subject matter that under specifiable conditions self-differentiates and self-develops—a nonmediated or natural form of "subjectivity" that begins with the self-division of the cell. It is from this primal *Urteil* that all life's story unfolds.

In modern philosophy, the term "nature" does not refer to a selfsame state of the world, but to the totality of lawful movements of this selfsame world. Hegel's use of the term is no exception. In its generic use, *die Natur* refers to the whole of incessant motions, transitions, and metamorphoses of what there is, the ceaseless and self-contained transformations of spatial and temporal being or *Dasein*.

Perhaps the most radical transformation in and by nature is the one that results in physical, organically structured units. In the *Philosophy of Nature* Hegel shows that for the self-moving organism to exist at all, its principle must first lay dormant in the inorganic world.²² But the *Anthropology's* opening section (*Enc* §388) introduces an even farther-reaching dimension of reality than that of nature releasing life from itself. This section (partly quoted above in chapter 1) must be given here in near entirety:

Spirit has *become* as the truth of nature. In addition to the fact that in the Idea this result has, in general terms, the meaning of truth and, more to the point, of being prior to what precedes it, the becoming or transitioning into the concept has the more determinate meaning of *free diremption* [des freien Urteils]. Spirit that has become means, therefore, that nature self-sublates over against itself [*an ihr selbst*] as the untrue, so that spirit presupposes itself as this universality, yet no longer a *self-external* one of bodily singularity but one that is, in its concreteness and totality, *simple* universality in which spirit is *soul*, not yet spirit [Seele, *noch nicht Geist*]. (*Enc* §388)

This opening paragraph deserves to be parsed in some detail.

(i) The first notable feature is its teleological (or rather entelechistic) character. To say that spirit emerges from nature does not mean that spirit is

nature's byproduct or excess residue. Rather, if nature is the totality of existing law-determined movements, then every event will have been possible (or is contained *dunamei*) in this totality at all times, and this means that it will be logically prior to its factual occurrence. The second sentence makes this explicit: for spirit to result from nature means that spirit is the truth of nature, and thus logically prior to spirit itself as a reality (as a "result").

Though in the cognitive order principles are discovered last, they are still the *principia* of the objectivity being cognized. The metaphysical outlook at work here was best formulated by one who rejected it long before Hegel readopted it: "This doctrine concerning an end altogether overturns nature. For that which is true in the cause it considers as the effect, and vice versa. Again, that which is first in nature it puts last" (Spinoza, *Ethics*, part 1, appendix). This nature-upending doctrine is precisely the doctrine that Hegel defends. While he appreciates the epochal contribution of Enlightenment materialism to overcoming the ontological rift of dualism, Hegel also criticizes that materialism for its inability to explain the glaringly evident and logically necessary inner teleology of living nature:

[Materialism] ignores altogether that as the cause sublates itself in the effect, and the means in the actualized end, so also that whose result thinking is supposed to be is rather sublated in the latter; and that spirit as such is not brought about by another, but rather brings itself about from being-in-itself to being-for-itself, from its concept to actuality, and makes what is supposed to posit it into something it posits. Yet one must acknowledge in materialism the enthusiastic drive to . . . sublate this rupture of what is originally One [*diese Zerreissung des ursprünglich Einen*]. (*Enc* §389 Zus)

Thus spirit can be said to be the "truth of nature" become explicit, because it is always already contained in nature—albeit in a potential, in-concept-only condition. The first stirrings of living nature evident in the natural soul represent precisely this transition from the in-itself to the for-itself mode of its actuality.²³

The image of spirit "moving from concept to actuality" may strike us as awkward, if not mystical. It can be elucidated, however, by distinguishing Hegel's various uses of the term *Begriff*.

The (at least) fourfold use of *Begriff* in Hegel's published writings often gives rise to confusion: (a) *der Begriff* without qualification is the technical term for the *logical concept* in the *Science of Logic*, or the concept of the Idea; (b) *Begriff von*. . . , just like the English phrase "concept of . . .," refers to the conceptualization of any content—empirical, formal, or virtual objects of thought; (c) *der Inbegriff* is a common German expression used to signify the sum total of the *essential* features of an object, for example, the exemplary case or even the epitome of a phenomenon; (d) in expressions like the

one being analyzed here, in which spirit-as-mere-concept is said to become a reality, Hegel is simply appealing to German readers' immediate association with the common locution *im Begriff sein*: "to be in the process of doing," or "becoming something not yet completed."

(ii) The second notable feature of the *Anthropology's* opening section is its scrupulously dynamic understanding of nature. As in a parthenogenesis of cosmic dimensions, nature is understood as giving birth to its own and yet distinct reality. There is for Hegel, to paraphrase his own interpretation of the pivotal thought of Plato's *Parmenides*, no insurmountable contradiction between being One and Not-One: the Not-One is implicit in the One. It goes without saying that when he claims that spirit is nature's implicit truth, Hegel is not using "truth" as synonymous with "propositional truth." Expressions like "X is the truth of Y" become less mysterious if read in the framework of an Aristotelian ontology like Hegel's: whatever exists *dunamei* (or *im Begriff*) is true in a weaker sense than its full actualization in *energeia* (or as completed *Begriff*). By releasing life- and thought-forms from out of itself, nature ceases to be a system of exclusively mechanical and chemical laws, a silent universe of inertial bodies only disturbed by the passing imbalances of the attractive and repulsive forces which those bodies consist of. In this complete externality, nature is "untrue" to itself in the sense that it harbors potentialities it has not yet realized. Whenever and wherever nature does overcome its pure exteriority, it becomes truer to itself, closer to its own perfection. New forces are being released—not just outward connections of mutually indifferent inorganic bodies, but relations internal to them.

A close reading of §388 shows that, just like the original division, also the original sublation is entirely nature's own. There is no agent but nature to perform the transformation at issue and there is no otherness for nature to sublimate. No doubt, the sentence "nature self-sublates over against itself as the untrue" is, even in German, somewhat obscure.²⁴ Wallace's translation: "nature in its own self realizes its untruth and sets itself aside" (Wallace and Miller 1971, 29) misreads *an ihr selbst* as *in ihr selbst*. This rendition is also unhelpful in suggesting a self-reflective capacity (almost a personality) of nature. Petry's subtler translation: "nature of its own accord sublates itself as being inadequate to truth" (Hegel 1978, trans. Petry, 2:3), is closer to Hegel's position in that it stresses the independent or absolute character of this natural occurrence, but still evades the problem of nature's sublation *an ihr selbst* by freely paraphrasing "of its own accord." Moreover, Petry's rendering leaves unspecified that the inadequacy at issue is nature's own, its falling short of itself. Here Petry replaces Hegel's concept of the untrue—*das Unwahre*—with that of untruth—*Unwahrheit*. But far from having interchangeable meanings, "the untrue" is for Hegel the referent of "untruth" (just as "the true" is the referent of "truth"). Petry's translation therefore suggests a notion of truth as *adequatio rei et intellectus* that Hegel does not use in this passage and explicitly rejects in other contexts: "Ordinarily we

call truth the agreement of an object with our representation . . . In the philosophical sense, however, truth is, to express this abstractly, the agreement of a content with itself" (*L Enc* §24 Zus 2). Petry's translation leaves us guessing what preordained truth it may be to which nature strives to adequate itself.

Despite its linguistic eccentricity, the passage from §388 can be fairly elucidated against the background of anticipatory considerations found in the introduction to the *Philosophy of Nature* (especially *PhN Enc* §§247–51), where Hegel outlines the transition from nature to spirit that connects the *Philosophy of Nature* with the *Philosophy of Spirit*.

The concept of nature from that introduction denotes the whole of real appearances (*Erscheinungen*) that are said to be the "negative side" of total actuality, or of the Idea. In other words, the philosophy of nature is about nature in its exteriority, which Hegel calls, for reasons soon to be specified, "self-externality" (*Aussersichsein*). But an adequate concept of all that is—of *Wirklichkeit* as opposed to mere *Realität*—must include the nonappearing ground of the appearances. The reason for calling nature the negative side of the Idea is, then, that nature subsists only in spatial-temporal exteriority, which is another way of saying that it exists as a totality of appearances. Of course, the Idea and its *phainomenon*, nature, are not separable: the Idea does not overcome phenomenal nature, because nature is one elemental mode of the Idea's existence (*PhN Enc* §247).

Nature is therefore beset by an immanent contradiction: it is the existence of the Idea, but only in a mode inadequate to the fullness of the Idea's concept, namely in the mode of pure exteriority (*PhN Enc* §250). This is a self-estranged condition which, incidentally, is the source of the deep-seated reverence and also repugnance with which we regard nature.²⁵ That real contradiction is reflected in the self-oppositional character of natural systems. Hegel uses the term "self-opposition" mostly with reference to the intrinsic imbalance of existing systems. This notion provides him with a fundamental explanation of their intrinsic dynamism. Self-opposition is what propels temporarily stable systems beyond their present state. In the greater *Science of Logic* this is expressed, with regard to the category "something" (*Etwas*), in the following words: "The other determination [of something] is the restlessness of the something inside the limit in which it is immanent, this restlessness being the *contradiction* that thrusts it beyond itself" (*WdL W* 5:138). In the sequel, self-opposition is shown to be the characteristic feature of all that is finite, which includes, of course, the "merely external" things of nature: "Something, posited with its immanent limit as the contradiction of itself, by which it indicates outwardly and is driven beyond itself, is the *finite*" (*WdL W* 5:139). Contrary to simple self-identity, which is the abstractly logical—or better yet, tautological—feature of dead being, self-contradiction is revealed to be "the root of all movement and life; only insofar as something harbors a contradiction in itself does it move, has drive and activity" (*WdL W* 6:75).

Only thanks to its contradictory core does nature transform itself from mere exteriority (inorganic systems) to biological centeredness (organic systems), to natural inwardness (souls), and eventually to full-fledged spirit, which is “the truth and end goal of nature and the true actuality of the Idea” (*PhN Enc* §251).

In this light, the problematic phrase about nature’s self-sublation over against itself is best interpreted along the following lines.

First, the Idea’s merely natural existence is being sublated as “the untrue” because, while externality is indeed one dimension of what there is, actuality entails more: “the true is the whole” (*PhenG* W 3:24). Second, the Idea-as-nature can accomplish this sublation only as a self-sublation because nothing else is there (no other *Dasein* exists) as yet, apart from nature. Before self-sublation takes place, nature is the only mode in which the Idea exists, and is hence the only reality to be sublated and to do the sublating. Third, by overcoming this one-sided, natural way of being, the Idea does not purge itself out of existence. It just transitions into another, richer, more concrete (in Hegel’s sense of differentiated) mode of existence. The following is Hegel’s concise rendering of what the reader can expect to discover at the conclusion of the *Philosophy of Nature*:

Nature is *in itself* a living whole. The movement [of nature] . . . consists . . . of this, that the Idea *posits* itself as what it is *in-itself*; or, in other words, that the Idea moves *inwardly* out of its immediacy and externality, which is *death*, so as to be, first, *living being*; but further, [the movement consists of the Idea’s] sublating even this determinacy, in which it is only life, and generating itself as the existence of spirit [*und sich zur Existenz des Geistes hervorbringe*], which is the truth and final end of nature and the true actuality of the Idea. (*PhN Enc* §251)

This self-positing of the Idea, Hegel comments in this section’s Addition, can be described in many ways: “a manifestation, a stepping out, a self-display, a coming forth from itself” (*PhN Enc* §251 Zus). In its myriad manifestations, however, the Idea remains one:

The Concept [of the Idea] maintains itself in them as their unity and ideality; and this expanding of the center to the periphery is therefore also, viewed from the reverse side, a resuming of this outwardness into inwardness, an inward recollecting [*ein Erinnern*] of the fact that it is the Concept that exists in the manifestation. (*PhN Enc* §251 Zus)

The talk of an inwardization or recollection of the Idea in its concept (or in the Concept) is not meant to convey a vanishing of physical nature into ideality. The Idea never discards its own physicality. Inwardness is just the other

mode of existence of the Idea that nonetheless continues to lead an exterior existence. From an abstract, logical point of view, nature's life forms consist precisely of this inwardization of the purely external.

Having therefore begun from exteriority, in which the Concept finds itself at first, its progression is a self-collecting [*Insichgehen*] into a center, that is, a developing of the Concept's immediate and exterior existence, which is inadequate to it, toward subjective unity or inward being [*Insichsein*]; not, however, as if the Concept would pull itself out of exteriority and shed it as a dead skin, but rather so that existence as such be inward and adequate to the Concept, or so that that kind of inward being may exist, which life is. (*PhN Enc* §251 Zus)

Long before individual souls begin to feel, or minds begin to think, nature harbors potentialities for whose actualization its merely physical existence proves inadequate. This is the original opposition intrinsic to the Idea that explains, in Hegel's view, why life or the natural soul comes into being in the first place. As we will see in what follows, self-opposition, far from being confined to a primordial condition of nature, remains the lifeblood of the soul.

4. Natural Spirit

As with all key concepts or system-ordering principles (*Grundbegriffe*) of Hegel's philosophy, the soul can only be defined in view of other principles that co-determine its functional place in the system and thus contribute to the determination of its meaning. In the *Anthropology*, corporeity, spirit, force, matter, ideality, and immateriality are the key concepts against which we can determine the full meaning of being-soul.

On the one hand, in contrast with dead corporeal being, "soul" denotes the immateriality or ideality of nature:

The soul is not only for itself immaterial, but is rather the universal immateriality of nature [*die allgemeine Immaterialität der Natur*], nature's simple ideal life. (*Enc* §389)²⁶

On the other hand, in contrast with forms of spirit, being-soul is their shared natural foundation, that which sustains them all:

[The soul] is the *substance*, the absolute foundation of all particularization and singularization of spirit, so that *the latter* has in the soul all the material [*Stoff*] of its own determination while the soul remains the pervasive, identical ideality of that determination. (*Enc* §389)

Being-soul, then, must be understood as both ideality of nature and substantiality of spirit. Setting out from Aristotle's classification of the emotions and affections of *psuchē* as paradoxically "enmattered concepts" (*logoi enuloi*; *Da* I.1 403a25),²⁷ as well as from his acknowledgment that "the attributes of soul appear to be all conjoined with body" (*Da* I.1 403a16), Hegel extends this Aristotelian definition to include the whole of the living body, that is, the totality of what is passible of affection and self-affection. The entirety of natural spirit is *logos* always already *enulos*, a form that always exists, not just in, but as a living body.

The importance of this expanded notion of hylomorphism in Hegel's account of living nature has been argued in the previous chapter.²⁸ Its significance can now be highlighted in some more detail.

Hegel, as we have seen, defends a conception of the soul as being both (i) the intrinsic immateriality of material nature and (ii) the material substrate of real spirit.

(i) The reason for the first characterization lies in the very notion of "live matter." Living bodies cannot be distinguished from nonliving ones exclusively on the basis of material features, since all physical things, living or dead, share the fundamental (physicochemical) building blocks of the universe. It is likewise irrational to conceive the soul as subsisting in a matterless vacuum inside materiality, as Epicurus is said to have done when he spoke of a divine substance living in the *intermundia* between physical beings. Immateriality is rather a connotation of the concept of matter that is inseparable from it:

Recently, matter has thinned out even from under the hands of the physicists; they have happened upon *imponderable* matters [*Stoffe*] like heat, light, and so forth, to which they could easily add space and time. These imponderables which have lost the characteristic feature of matter, namely gravity, as well as in a sense the capacity to oppose resistance, still have sensible being, a self-externality. But *vital matter* [*Lebensmaterie*], which one also finds listed among these, lacks not only gravity but any other [mode of] being by virtue of which one could still assign it to the *material*. (*Enc* §389 Anm)

In the literature of Hegel's time the term "vital matter" appears rarely, while "vital force" (*Lebenskraft*) is the standard term, but the two are interchangeable. Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (a major source of Kant, Humboldt, and Hegel's anthropologies) calls "vital matter" the *solidum vivum*²⁹ and defines it as "mucous membrane (commonly, but improperly called cellular tissue)" (*Beyträge*, chap. 9, 50–51). For Blumenbach, the *solidum vivum* is the material substrate of capacities like "contractility" that enable organisms to receive and react to stimuli. On the verge of life, inorganic nature's self-differentiations result in physical units separating out from their environs.

The simplest amoeba struggles to separate itself from the surroundings that it inexorably belongs to. The amoeba *is* this struggle of nature against itself. The logic of its life is the logic of osmosis: a porous wall or plasma membrane both counter the effort at self-differentiation and make it possible. In the words of the physiologist Xavier Bichat (who was much admired by Hegel), a living being is nature's point of resistance against cosmic death—what we call today universal entropy. Bichat writes: "People seek the definition of life in abstract considerations; but one will find it, I believe, in this general insight: *life is the totality of functions that resist death.*"³⁰

The living body's unceasing attempt to downgrade its surroundings to the status of necessary but insufficient conditions of itself is its most basic characteristic. This activity is the distinguishing feature of what Hegel calls "the soul still captive in nature" (*PhS Enc* §387 Zus). Electric forces, water, light, food and temperature do not confer life on inorganic bodies, though they are its necessary conditions. While they make life possible, they are insufficient causes for it.

Hegel's argument draws once again from Aristotle, who first insisted on the necessity that *psuchē* be understood as the first entelechy of the right kind of *sōma*, that is, of a physical entity with the potential to become alive. Aristotle reprimands his predecessors because

they attach the soul to, and enclose it in, body, without further determining *why* this happens and *what is the condition of the body*. And yet some such explanation would seem to be required, as it is owing to what they have in common [*dia tēn koinōnian*]³¹ that the one acts, the other is acted upon. (*Da* I.3 407b15–19; emphases added)

As for those who theorize that any kind of body may in principle become alive by the intrusion of an alien kind of form, they are, according to Aristotle, no philosophers but rather mythologists:

The supporters of such theories merely undertake to explain the nature of the soul. Of the body which is to receive it they have nothing more to say, just as if it were possible for any random soul, as in the Pythagorean myths, to pass into any random body. (*Da* I.3 407b20–25)

In Aristotle's *Parts of Animals*, this necessary, mutual fittingness of body and soul is expressed even more straightforwardly as a requirement that the body be "made for the soul":

As . . . every bodily member is for the sake of . . . some action, so the whole body must evidently be for the sake of some complex action. Thus . . . the body . . . must somehow or other be made for the

soul, and each part of it for some subordinate function, to which it is adapted. (*Parts of Animals* 645b14–19)³²

Taken together with these considerations, *De anima*'s definition of *psuchē* as the “essence and concept” of a self-moving body is compelling: “For it is not of a body of this kind [i.e., an axe] that the soul is the essence [*to ti ēn einai*] and concept [*logos*], but of a particular physical thing having in itself the principle [*archē*] of motion and rest” (*Da* II.1 412a15). This is just the sense in which Hegel uses *Seelen* to refer to particular bodies; namely, totalities whose functional organization around a center renders them alive.³³

(ii) The second characterization of the soul as the material (or somatic) substance of spirit is best explicated by emphasizing that the modes of subjective spirit treated subsequently to its natural stage—consciousness, self-consciousness, intelligence, and will—are all modes of existence of *one and the same* spirit. But spirit only exists in space and time, in the infinitely varied activities in which it attains various degrees (or “stages”) of mastery over its own naturalness. What unifies all of spirit's wildly different actualizations is the enduring logic of its concept: even the loftiest manifestations of intelligence and will can be traced back in the end to capacities of the natural soul—or the living body. It is always one spirit that, to use Hegel's Aristotelian imagery again, sleeps as soul, wakes as consciousness, and cognizes as spirit proper.

The soul is, then, hylomorphic not just in the sense that the word denotes a living body as well as an emergent spirit, but in the sense that it is the substance common to the somatic as well as mental capacities and activities of all living beings.

Hegel, however, goes further. His grounding of the notion of the soul in Aristotle's theory of *psuchē* is not limited to characterizing the soul as natural substance or as immateriality of material nature. It extends further to include the capacity of *psuchē* to become *noūs* (intellect). Likewise, the history of soul's emergence from nature's physicality traced in the *Anthropology* is not limited to bridging the gap between the physical and the immaterial existence of spirit. It is primarily meant to lend descriptive corroboration, and as much logical proof as is appropriate in a philosophy of reality, to a further speculative truth already found in *De anima*:

If, then, we have to make a general statement about all kinds of soul, the soul will be the first actuality [*entelecheia he prôtē*] of a natural body furnished with organs. Hence there is no need to enquire whether soul and body are one . . . nor in general whether the matter of each thing and that of which it is the matter are one. For of all the various meanings borne by the terms one and being, actuality is the meaning which belongs to them most properly. (*Da* II.1 412b4–9)

The soul is principally defined . . . firstly, by motion from place to place and, secondly, by thinking [*noein*] and judging [*krinein*] and

perceiving [*aisthanesthai*] . . . By intellect [*noûs*] I mean that whereby the soul thinks and conceives. (*Da* III.3 427a17–19 and 429a23)

For once, Hegel himself is admirably concise on this issue: “The soul is the *existent* Concept, the existence of the speculative. It is therefore the simple, *omnipresent* unity in the corporeal . . . In the feeling soul, the corporeal is reduced to *ideality*”³⁴ (*Enc* §403 Anm).

All modes of spirit, in Hegel’s interpretation, are successive actualizations of soul’s potentialities. While in *De anima* the most far-reaching of these actualizations issues in active, self-thinking *noûs poiētikos* (active intellect), in the *Philosophy of Subjective Spirit* they give rise to active, self-knowing reason.

To be sure, these are advanced developments that Hegel begins to trace only in those parts of *Subjective Spirit* that follow the *Anthropology*. The “anthropological” study of the natural soul stops short of the stage at which its subject matter becomes spirit fully awake, reason grasping itself in a world of its own making. Hegel’s investigation focuses only on what he calls “this still abstract determination [in which] the soul is only the *sleep* of spirit—the *passive noûs* of Aristotle that, as far as *possibility*, is all things” (*Enc* §389).³⁵ Yet there is much in the higher stages of spirit that sheds light on its simpler forms as soul. In particular, the soul’s connotation as natural phenomenon and spirit-in-the-making is reflected in the twofold character of each stage of spirit: consciousness, self-consciousness, intelligence, will, and reason. A glimpse ahead to the conclusion of the journey that begins with the unintelligent soul and ends in art, religion and philosophy may help brighten the contours of our lethargic precursor of absolute spirit.

In the closing sections of the *Encyclopaedia*, Hegel maintains that this system of philosophy is the reasoned exposition of the logic of the “*self-thinking Idea*” (*PhS Enc* §574) and that the elements of this logic can be displayed as a sequence of three syllogisms, the last of which combines in itself the other two. In the first of these syllogisms of reality, logic and nature are premises of the existence of spirit; in the second, nature and spirit are premises of the existence of logic; and in the third, spirit and logic are premises of the existence of nature.

This (even by Hegelian standards) remarkably dense argument is encapsulated in the three final sections of the *Encyclopaedia* (*PhS Enc* §§575–77). The argument has been helpfully dissected by several interpreters.³⁶ For our present purpose, which is only the explication of natural spirit’s drive to develop into full-fledged spirit, only one aspect of these three sections is of critical importance. This is the circumstance that the three syllogisms of the Idea, while having the *form* in common with formal logical syllogisms, in fact reflect in their *content* the ways in which the Idea really exists and dirempts itself—a point that Hegel repeatedly insists upon in this text.³⁷

According to the general doctrines of judgment and syllogism expounded in the second division of the *Science of Logic* (*WdL* W 6:301–98), from a

purely formal perspective, the categorical judgment's only function is to make explicit a necessary connection between subject and predicate, and the categorical syllogism's function is to prove the judgment's claim. As one scholar puts it: "The syllogism relates to the judgment like the *justification* of a claim relates to its *assertion*."³⁸ But a syllogism of the Idea of the kind expounded in the *Encyclopaedia's* §§575–77 expresses the logic of actuality. If it justifies (if it provides reasons for) the concluding judgment, it gives us not only the ground of cognition, but the ground of existence of the subject matter. (Hegel's qualified defense of the ontological argument has its roots in this conception.)

In any valid categorical syllogism, the entailment of the conclusion by the major and minor premises is made explicit by the indissoluble connection of subject and predicate in the conclusion. In Hegel's ontological analysis this connection can be of three kinds: immediate, mediated, or absolute. A syllogism of the first kind is a syllogism of being (*Schluss des Daseins*); one of the second kind is a syllogism of reflection (*Reflektionsschluss*); and one of the third kind is a syllogism of necessity (*Schluss der Notwendigkeit*).

These formal distinctions are reflected in the function of the three syllogisms that conclude the encyclopaedic exposition of the philosophical sciences. The first (logic-nature-spirit) has for its major premise the subject matter of the *Science of Logic*, here called *das Logische*;³⁹ the minor premise is provided by the subject matter of the *Philosophy of Nature*, called *die Natur*; and the subject matter of the conclusion is that of the *Philosophy of Spirit*, or *der Geist*. This figure recapitulates the way in which, in the system, nature has been proven to be the linkage of logic with spirit. According to this first figure, spirit results from logic by way of nature; or, if one prefers, the logic of nature gives rise to the existence of spirit. This constellation, Hegel notes, brings to the fore nature's role as the negative moment or merely in-itself condition of the Idea, which is why he calls this the syllogism of mere being.

The next syllogism (nature-spirit-logic) represents another manner of diremption of the Idea. Here the medium is spirit, the self-relating substance in which nature and logic come together. Having grasped the first syllogism, spirit now knows itself as resulting from the logic of nature. This figure illustrates the Idea in its for-itself condition—it is the syllogism of reflection.

The third syllogism (spirit-logic-nature) represents the final mode of diremption of the Idea. The medium which binds all that is real—actual spirit and actual nature—is the logic of actuality. This syllogism expresses the fact that nature or the Idea in-itself, and spirit or the Idea for-itself, are held together by "the logical" or, as it is called elsewhere, "the logical Idea" (*L Enc* §187 Zus). The overall object of the *Science of Logic* is, then, the Idea in-and-for-itself. Nature and spirit are its two actualizations. The figure that makes this connection explicit is the syllogism of necessity. Hence, the concept of the Idea in-and-for-itself, *der Begriff*, is the exhaustive

concept, *der Inbegriff*, of all there is: neither just being, nor just the essence of being, but the unconditioned or “absolute” actuality of both. (Hegel uses the perfect participle of the Latin word *absolvere* in its primary etymology: “loosened” or “absolved”—as in the Christian *ego te absolvo* from all conditions.)

Hegel understands the concept of the Idea as akin to that of a speculative thinking activity (the *noēsis noēseōs noēsis* of *Metaphysics* Λ 9, 1074b33–34),⁴⁰ that is, of a noetic activity related and fully transparent to itself. Hegel calls it *Vernunft*: the Idea is reason thinking itself as substance that is at once natural and spiritual, material and immaterial.

Here is Hegel’s explication of the final syllogism:

The third syllogism is the Idea of philosophy, which has for its *middle reason knowing itself*, the absolutely universal, [a middle] that splits into *spirit* and *nature*. . . , making the former into . . . the *subjective* activity of the Idea, and the latter into . . . the process of the Idea existing *in-itself*, objectively. The *self-dirempting* [Sich-Urteilen] of the Idea in both appearances . . . determines them as *its* (self-knowing reason’s) manifestations; what is being unified in it is . . . the very nature of the subject matter,⁴¹ the Concept that moves onward and develops, and this movement is equally the activity of knowing, [by which] the eternal Idea in-and-for-itself acts, engenders, and enjoys itself for ever as absolute spirit. (*PhS Enc* §577)⁴²

This is the last of the system’s numbered sections in the *Philosophy of Spirit*. Hegel, however, lets Aristotle have the final word on the matter, as if perhaps to reassure his readers that self-knowing reason’s own eternal bliss, or its releasing of nature and spirit from itself, are not philosophical surrenders to creationist theology:⁴³

Intellection [*he noēsis*] in itself refers to what is in itself best: and the highest intellection to what is highest. The intellect [*ho noūs*] thinks itself by sharing in what is being thought, for the intellect becomes thought by touching on and thinking [its object]. In this way intellect and thought are the same. For the intellect is capable of taking up the thought as well as the substance. It is in an active condition when it has them. Therefore the latter rather than the former is the divine that thinking appears to possess; and contemplation [*theōria*]⁴⁴ is what is most pleasant and best . . . And life belongs to it; for the activity of the intellect is life, and the divine is that activity; the activity in itself is its best and eternal life. We say therefore that the eternal, best animal [*zōon aidion, ariston*] is the divine,⁴⁵ so that life continuous and eternal belongs to the divine. For this is what the divine is. (*Metaphysics* Λ 1072b20–30)⁴⁶

For all the exhilaration of this ending, our present task is to grasp the vastly less divine, considerably less pleasant, and distinctively mortal beginnings of life.⁴⁷ The true is after all the whole, and to the whole belong both the end and the beginning, the paroxysms of reason as much as the first tremors of feeling matter. It is to the latter that we must now return.



Hegel's notion that physical nature is implicitly immaterial is very much in keeping with the way in which nineteenth-century physics grasped a body's mass as force, or twentieth-century physics conceived of gravitational fields as modifications of space-time. For Hegel, the most vivid case of the actualization of this immateriality is life, or the natural soul. To better understand how immateriality turns out to be the core of matter for Hegel, it is helpful to first examine his concept of materiality as it refers to both physical things in general and to living things in particular.

The abstract logical concept that encapsulates the core-meaning of "matter" is for Hegel the notion of "self-external being" (*Aussersichsein*). This expression signifies any existent whose parts, whether conceived as finite or infinite in number, are reciprocally external. The core-feature of nature understood as the exterior (or negative) dimension of actuality is its essential externality (*Äusserlichkeit*; *PhN Enc* §247). Thinking of nature in these terms means, of course, capturing how it is in-itself: innumerable coexisting and mutually indifferent entities. But this being "does not correspond to its concept" (*PhN Enc* §248 Anm) because nature's concept includes the essence, that is, the inwardness or potentialities of nature. Hegel makes this point repeatedly with constant reference to arguments and illustrations from books 6 and 7 of Aristotle's *Physics*, book Z of the *Metaphysics*, and book II of *De anima*:

The infinite divisibility of matter⁴⁸ means nothing but that matter is something external to itself [*ein sich selbst Äusserliches*] . . . Since every material point appears to be completely independent of all others, absence of conceptuality [*Begrifflosigkeit*] predominates in nature . . . It is only in life that subjectivity, the opposite of exteriority [*Aussereinander*], emerges; heart, liver, eye are for themselves no independent individuals, and the hand severed from the body rots.⁴⁹ (*PhN Enc* §248 Zus)

A different but related definition of materiality can be found in the unlikely context of the *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*.⁵⁰ Hegel's interest here lies primarily in the elucidation of the concept of spirit, since the object of the lectures is spirit's self-objectification in history. But the contrast he draws with "matter" sheds useful light on his conception of materiality:

Matter is heavy insofar as it is driven towards a center point; . . . it seeks its own unity and thus tries to sublate itself . . . If it attained this state, it would be matter no longer . . . Spirit by contrast is precisely what has the center point in itself; it does not have its unity outside itself . . . Matter has its substance outside itself; spirit is *being-by-itself*. (*PhGesch* W 12:30)

A material body consists of centripetal and centrifugal forces balancing each other out, lest the body itself should become immaterial. The mutual resistance of these opposing forces, the ground of physical impenetrability, is the basis for Hegel's definition of physicality as self-externality. All of a corporeal thing's relations are such that the thing is indifferent to them: they are merely external connections which the body neither seeks nor establishes. It is simply caught in their web. Without this complete exteriority, no physical thing's space would be impenetrable by others. Without exteriority, a thing is nothing. Furthermore, the "indifference" inherent to bodies insofar as they are physical must also apply to their every physical part down to their chemical (and we may add, subatomic) components. Hence, a purely physical universe must be conceptualized as the totality of reciprocal relations external to the *relata* themselves. This is why in Hegel's conception of physical thinghood, things are forces,⁵¹ and the universe is a field of forces. Matter may well have to be represented (*vorgestellt*) as solid, liquid, gaseous, or "magnetic" (formerly earth, water, air, or fire). However, it can only be conceived (*begriffen*) as immaterial. In the concise and startling formulation of the second section of the *Anthropology* given below: "Spirit is the existing truth of matter, that matter itself has no truth" (*Enc* §389 Anm).

To be a physical entity therefore entails not just being external to other physical entities, but also being self-external. Inorganic bodies subsist in universal indifference to all others as well as to themselves (which is, incidentally, the reason why they neither self-move nor reproduce nor die). In this most basic of naturalistic frameworks, the absence of self-relation makes other-relations impossible. The concept of a purely material nature is the concept of unhindered, absolute exteriority.

It is otherwise with living matter.⁵² It does not exhaustively consist of outward relations. The living body is not just situated where external forces place it. It actively seeks, establishes, or avoids outward connections. And it does so by virtue of its incessant relation to its own center. The living body does not just grow larger by aggregation or smaller by decomposition, but develops or withers away. It does not merely incorporate other bodies, but assimilates them and even produces them out of itself. It does not shatter or disintegrate: it actually dies. Life is the manifestation of natural forces that actively counter the bare externality of physical bodies. Organicity is the first breach into self-external bodies in that it consists of a functional specialization between their center and their periphery. The forming of such an inward

center marks the most primitive phase of inwardization. At first, this new centeredness only leads to a natural kind of “subjectivity” that is still a condition of complete dependence on the physical surroundings (the living body must after all always be corporeal):

We have called the form of spirit which we must treat first *subjective* spirit, because spirit is here still in its undeveloped concept, not having made its concept objective to itself. In this its subjectivity, however, spirit is at once also objective, has an immediate [sort of] reality by whose sublation alone it becomes for-itself, arrives . . . to a grasp of its concept, its subjectivity.” (*PhS Enc* §387 Zus)

Only in the final stage of this process does substance become subjectivity proper.⁵³

In spirit . . . the self-externality that constitutes the fundamental determination of matter has totally evaporated [*verflüchtigt*] into the subjective ideality of the Concept. Spirit is the existent truth of matter, that matter itself has no truth. (*Enc* §389 Anm)

A superficial reading may suggest an interpretation of this passage as claiming that spirit, the other of nature, sublates the latter, “evaporating” it in itself. But as has already been argued in this chapter, Hegel’s point is a different one. Indeed, this passage comes on the heels of the main texts of both the first and second sections of the *Anthropology*, whose meaning the Remark is intended to explicate: “Spirit has *become* as the truth of nature” (*Enc* §388) and “The soul is . . . the *substance* of spirit . . . so that spirit has in the soul all the material for its own determination” (*Enc* §389). Hegel’s point, then, is that self-external nature sublates itself (or, more accurately, that the Idea sublates its one-sidedly extrinsic, natural existence) to become spirit in its various forms—the first such form being the natural soul. Hence, the form “in which spirit is *soul*, not yet spirit” results from nature’s self-sublation. Both Kehler’s and Griesheim’s transcripts of Hegel’s oral commentary on §389 show him going to great lengths to address this point:

That the externality and manifold of matter cannot be overcome by nature is a presupposition that from our standpoint, the standpoint of speculative philosophy, we have long ago left behind as being invalid. (*Enc* §389 Zus)

Spirit is essentially this, to come to itself [*zu sich selbst zu kommen*], to exist *through nature*, or more precisely, through the sublation of the one-sided form in which the Idea is as nature . . . *This transitioning*

of nature into spirit is nature's transitioning into its own truth. (*Enc* §389, Kehler-Griesheim ms.; emphases added)⁵⁴

Whether the soul be inwardness in outward form, for example, in the simpler guises of bodily self-motion, assimilation, or irritability; or whether it be inwardness in inward form, for example, in the guise of sentience and mental awareness, the soul never sheds the corporeal condition of its existence—or it would lose itself in the process. In the following, Hegel presents us with his pivotal argument—all philosophy is idealism—in order to show why no forms of spirit (and not just the soul) may be rationally conceived as subsisting independently of corporeity, their necessary condition.

Chapter 3



False Enigmas and Real Beginnings

1. Mind-Body Conundrums and the Meaning of Idealism

In light of the soul's hylomorphic nature, definitions of life that are couched in terms of the interdependence or reciprocal influence of body and mind strike Hegel as some of the most incoherent positions that Western thought has been able to devise.

This tradition has dealt with the mind-body relation in terms of their interaction, their communion, their identity in God, and even in the cruder categories of their commerce and interpenetration. Some have attempted to solve the problem of this relation by means of ratiocination; others have appealed to the study of physiology; and still others have declared it to lie beyond the purview of human knowledge. All share the same premises, according to which the body is some well-known true thing (*ein Wahres*), while spirit or mind (or sometimes "soul") is some unknown thing (*ein Ding*), whose truth is in question (*Enc* §389 Anm). The well-known thing and the unknown entity have been represented as influencing or permeating one another, for example, by the infiltration of one into the orifices of the other—a peculiar conception which inexorably leads to the senseless conclusion that body and mind can only come together where one of them is not. This, incidentally, as we saw in section 4 of chapter 2, was a consequence fully intended by Epicurus who, by allowing the gods to reside in the pores of matter, ensured that they would never meddle with worldly affairs.

Of course, more refined ontologies (Hegel names here Descartes, Malebranche, Spinoza, and Leibniz) offer subtler solutions. Matter and mind, they claim, are different modes of the infinity of God. They commune with one another because they are finite aspects of the infinite One. Alongside these promising and fertile perspectives are the entirely unreflected ones of the physiologists and psychologists. Spirit and matter—for example, "I" and "my body"—are understood by these scientists as incommensurable entities, one fictional, the other real: the "I" is a mere thought reached by abstraction from bodily experiences, while the body is a thing experienced by the "I" as a

compound of manifold materials—a conception of experience unintelligible on its own right, if the “I” is supposed to be a mere thought.

This sleep of dialectical reason in the modern life sciences has begotten monsters, whose tentacles reach well into philosophy. The early French Enlightenment imagined the soul as a machine endowed with sensibility. In La Mettrie’s plain words: “To be a machine, to feel, to think, to know good from evil . . . are things no more contradictory than to be an ape or parrot and know how to find sexual pleasure.”¹ Others represented the soul as a non-extended entity which nonetheless has a seat in the body. Time and again, poets have envisioned the soul as the disembodied host or partner of the body (*hospes comesque corporis*, as the rhymester emperor Hadrian put it).² The soul has been conceived as endowed with qualities while also being independent of them, or it has been described as a self-enclosed, immaterial monad differing from matter-monads by degrees alone.

Hegel’s overall argument after this review of his predecessors in the Remark to §389 is that all these explanations fail because they all presuppose an original separatedness rather than the original unity of matter and spirit. The *Science of Logic* draws attention to the inevitable consequences of these types of reasoning. By attributing qualities like homogeneity or indivisibility to what is immaterial, and the opposite of these to matter, ratiocinating metaphysics affects to compare two modes of thinghood, all the while denying that one of them is a thing at all. But the attribution of thing-like qualities to what is not a thing is philosophical folly; and the denial of thing-like qualities to it is the apogee of triviality. Already in the “Physiognomy and Craniology” section of the *Phenomenology of Spirit* Hegel had drawn the necessary conclusions from this so-called materialism: “The reality of spirit is made into a thing or, expressed conversely, dead being is given the meaning of spirit . . . Whenever *being* as such or thinghood [*Dingsein*] is predicated of spirit, what is truly being said is that this being is like *a bone*” (*PhenG* W 3:259).

The consummate exposé of the devastating consequences of this theoretical madness is, however, 2,000 years old. It is found, according to Hegel, in the radical exercise in negative dialectic found in Plato’s *Parmenides*:

One must of course admit that, while in spirit the concrete unity is essential, and manifoldness is an illusion, in matter the reverse is the case. This is something of which ancient metaphysics already showed a foreboding when it asked whether the One or the Many be the first in spirit. (*Enc* §389 Zus)

“First in spirit” refers here to Hegel’s interpretation of the philosopher Parmenides’s question, in the middle of Plato’s homonymous dialogue (at 137b), as referring not to the abstract being (*einai*) of the ancient Parmenidean poem, but to the concrete, that is, the internally differentiated essence of the inquirer’s self (*to hen autos*).

Hegel is making the case here that the logic of subjective spirit was indeed foreshadowed, though in a formal and abstract manner, in ancient debates about the concepts of oneness and manifoldness, debates of which Plato's *Parmenides* is the most perspicuous (also maddening) instance. Hegel's reconstruction of the logic of the One and the Many in this dialogue is highly instructive with regard to his conception of the logical relation between soul and body.

In the middle of the dialogue the old Eleatic thinker introduces his audience to a form of radical skepticism by inviting them to discuss the meaning of "the One itself":³

Where shall we begin, then? What supposition shall we start with? Would you like me, since we are committed to play out this laborious game, to begin with myself and the supposition of myself?⁴ Shall I take the one itself and consider the consequences of assuming that there is, or is not, a one? (Plato, *Parmenides* 137b)

Those who presuppose as an unshakeable foundation of rational thought that the concept of "the One itself" can only refer to either one or a manifold but not both, unwittingly prove that nothing at all, or everything and its contradictory, can be predicated of such a One itself. In Plato's lengthy proof, the One turns out to be neither continuous nor discrete (137d), neither finite nor infinite (137e), neither self-contained nor contained in another (138a), neither moving nor at rest, neither changing nor unchanging (138b–139b), and neither identical to, nor different from, itself or another (139a–e).

In keeping with Kant's discussion of negative infinite judgments in the *Critique of Pure Reason*'s "Transcendental Logic" (*KrV* B 97–98),⁵ Hegel argues (*L Enc* §173) that "the total incommensurability of the subject and the predicate" in a "so-called *infinite* judgment"—for example, "a One is not a composite"—yields insights as meaningless as its formal opposite, the tautology. Here are the somewhat bizarre examples Hegel gives in the Remark to this paragraph of the *Encyclopedia Logic*: "'Spirit is not an elephant,' 'a lion is not a table,' etc.—propositions that are correct but pointless, exactly like the identical propositions: 'A lion is a lion,' 'spirit is spirit'" (*L Enc* §173 Anm).

This vacuity derives from artificially separating the explicitly affirmative ("A is A") and explicitly negative ("A is not non-A") sides of the infinite judgment as if they were not equivalent obversions. More importantly, the real itself is more complex than what can be captured by simply positive or simply negative judgments, let alone by their mechanical combination or artificial contrast. Being is not the sum total of what is, to the exclusion of what is not. Contrary to the Parmenideans, it can be proven, as done in the *Science of Logic*, that the concept or truth of being-as-being is the same concept or truth of nothing-as-nothing, so that being and nothing turn out to be short-hand for a movement in which they disappear into each other: becoming.

A fitting illustration of how this principle works in Hegel's philosophy of the real is (once again) found in the *Outlines of the Philosophy of Right*. In discussing the notion of right (*jus*, *Recht*), Hegel argues here that the existence of the modern state-of-right (*der Rechtsstaat*) goes hand in hand with the capacity of free agents to violate this rightful condition. There is no right without the real possibility of its infringement, that is, there is no right without freedom. (If the nature of the *état de droit* lay principally in its Hobbesian guarantee of safety, then, as Rousseau's *Social Contract* reminds us, dungeons would be the best states.)⁶

The rightful constitution (*Verfassung*) of the political life is not a static condition. It rather consists of the permanent righting of wrong, and it lasts only for as long as these opposing forces are at work. Particular wrongs (a particular fraud, an instance of crime) are not only violations of specific laws but always also violations of the state-of-right in general, as well as, through the negative recognition of it by the violators, the affirmation of the state-of-right. (Thus it is, incidentally, that the *Rechtsstaat* cannot exact qualitative or quantitative retaliation, but can only punish wrongdoers according to purely juridical-conventional measures.) This implies that the real domain of right encompasses three things: the Law (*das Recht*), the freedom to violate it, and the permanent reaffirmation of the Law. In treating the notion of Right in §§496–99 of the *Encyclopedia's Objective Spirit*, Hegel repeatedly uses the notion of infinite judgment which he has elucidated in the *Encyclopaedia Logic* (§173) and employs the concepts of positive and negative infinite judgment in defining “right.” He argues here that claims to the private ownership of specific objects (such as in civil litigation) produce the “illusion of right [*Schein des Rechts*]” (*PhS Enc* §496) in the form of a “simple negative judgment” that is at its core “unself-conscious wrong [*das unbefangene Unrecht*]” (*PhS Enc* §497). This wrong can only be resolved by appeal to “a third. . . , the judgment of right-in-itself [*Recht an sich*] that lacks all interest” in the particularities of the case. It requires, in other words, the impartial judgment of the state (through its juridical representatives). Fraud, to choose another example, is called the “infinite judgment of identity” (*PhS Enc* §498) because it implies the recognition of formal right together with its violation; and violent crime is the “negative infinite judgment” (*PhS Enc* §499) because it denies recognition to both the appearance of right (particular laws) and right in itself (the Law).

Mutatis mutandis, Hegel applies the same logic to his theoretical treatment of natural life. Individual death is not “a singular negative judgment,” that is, it is not just the incompatible contradictory of individual life. Death is not only a succumbing to illness, accident, or old age. Just as multiplicity is the negation of oneness implicit in the concept of the One, and crime is the negation of right implicit in the concept of right, so death is the negation of life implicit in life's concept (*L Enc* §173 Zus). Once again, Xavier Bichat says it best: life, far from being the incompatible other of death, “is the totality of functions that resist death.”⁷

This is the same dialectical conception that underlies Hegel's solution of the so-called "mind-body problem." Just as life is inseparable from and unintelligible without death, so spirit is inseparable from and unintelligible without the body. "Soul" denotes the concept of their unity. By ignoring the jointly twofold makeup of the soul as the last form of nature and first form of spirit we are prevented from fully grasping either nature or spirit; and we preclude ourselves a full comprehension of live matter. Under the assumption that spirit is just "spiritual" and nature just "natural," their connection remains an irresolvable enigma. Speculative philosophy shows how logical and semantic contradictories—materiality versus immateriality, externality versus inwardness, discreteness versus continuity, multiplicity versus oneness, or life versus death—express real contradictions in the Idea, in actuality itself.

Speculative logic already shows that all determinations being applied to the soul—like thing, simplicity, indivisibility, unity . . . pass over into their opposite. The philosophy of spirit in turn continues this proof . . . by showing how spirit, through its ideality, sublates in itself all fixed determinations. (*Enc* §389 Zus)

Spirit's "ideality," as we shall see in the next section, is for Hegel an activity of idealization made possible by the original unity of nature and spirit and by the capacity of nature to sublate itself, the process described here in chapter 2. This original unity has long been recognized, at different levels of intuition, representation, or conceptualization, in the making of art, in mythology, religion, natural science and philosophy. Hegel's speculative philosophy intends to make explicit this implicitly recognized truth.

In Zoroastrianism, for example, light is taken to be a reality at once physical and spiritual. Light in this religion is, in other words, the absolute. Hegel's *Lectures on Aesthetics*⁸ discuss this at somewhat greater length:

The religion of Zoroaster . . . takes *light* in its natural existence, the sun, heavenly bodies, fire . . . as the absolute, without separating this divine for itself from the light as mere manifestation, simulacrum, or symbol. The divine, the meaning, is not torn from its existence [*Das-
ein*] . . . Light . . . counts not just as a mere image of the good; rather, the good is itself light. (*Aesth I W* 13:420–21)

With Anaxagoras, the unity of nature and spirit finds expression in the *noûs* (*Enc* §389 Zus), whose concept, however, is less developed than that of substance in Spinozism. Anaxagoras, we read in the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, may well have been the earliest proponent of conceiving thought as the universal being, in which alone truth is found. He stands out "like a sober man among drunkards, though even his blows still fire pretty much into the air" (*GeschPh W* 18:369).

In Spinozism, the absolute is conceived as consisting of thought and extension at once: the whole (or the true) is “god or else nature.” Mindful of the contemporaneous pantheism (or atheism) controversy, Hegel comments that in general, all forms of so-called pantheism are rooted in a healthy intuition of the dialectical unity of nature and spirit, an intuition shared by individuals and peoples in their childhood. The physical world is always already spirit, and spirit is always already physical: the world is experienced as world-soul. Reality is a bacchanalian commotion in which everything and its opposite take place, while oneness prevails.

While these healthy intuitions form the rational core of ancient mythologies, religions, and philosophies, they are scorned by the philosophers of the ratiocinating age. These latter prefer to ignore the dialectic of reason. They assign opposites to separate spheres as if, for example, attraction were one force and repulsion another. According to their understanding, oneness denotes the antipode of multiplicity; living bodies must be understood as mechanically pulsing corpses; and the soul is represented as a disembodied entity. In a word, ratiocination posits spirit as incommensurable with matter. The sciences of man (physiology and psychology) take the lead in denying actual existence to the mind’s representations and indeed to mind itself. They may concede that spirit is real, but only if understood as a special kind of *thing*—a raw taste of which is offered again by La Mettrie who, wavering between literalism and metaphor, explains the nature of the soul with the words: “Only *a posteriori*, by unraveling the soul as one pulls out the guts from the body, can one . . . attain the highest degree of probability possible on the subject.”⁹

In sum, for Hegel the conundrum of the “communing” (*Gemeinschaft* or *commercium*) of matter and spirit is an ill-conceived problem because it presupposes them as separate principles in need of unification. But even modern physical science has come to acknowledge nature’s immateriality: gravitation, electricity, chemical bonds, and magnetism, physical forces which are not themselves material, are said to permanently hold together oneness and its manifoldness, sources and their manifestations, living organisms and their organs. Universal gravitation (the whole of reciprocal relations among reciprocally indifferent bodies) or even just the physical properties of light by themselves exhibit nature’s immateriality. Sentient animality demonstrates this in a more drastic way:

The philosophy of nature teaches us how nature sublates its exteriority in stages . . . through matter’s *gravitation* . . . and even more so through indivisible, simple *light*. This refutation [of exteriority] becomes perfected through animal life, through what is sentient, because this reveals to us the omnipresence of the one soul in all points of the soul’s corporeity, thus revealing that matter’s exteriority is overcome. (*Enc* §389 Zus)¹⁰

In the end, precritical science and metaphysics must find the relation between mind and matter to be inscrutable. A few scientific and metaphysical theories have considered sentience, on the model of digestion, to be simply the physical assimilation of corporeal particles. But even fewer would deny that mind idealizes matter when it thinks. No one has refuted Aristotle's matter-of-fact statement: "For the sense-organ is in every case receptive of the sensible object *without its matter*" (*Da* III.2 425b15; emphasis added).

For Hegel, therefore, the solution to the so-called "mind-body problem" lies in a radical change of paradigm. This is the core of "idealism" as Hegel understands it: not the emblem of a philosophical school but the essential activity of being itself, including the soul's activities of sensing, feeling, imagining, thinking, and acting in the world. Hegel devotes much of his oral commentary to §389 to defining this idealism. Perhaps the most explicit statement in this respect is found, however, in the preliminary section of the *Philosophy of Spirit*, entitled "Concept of Spirit":

This sublation of externality that belongs to the concept of spirit is what we have called the ideality of spirit. All activities of spirit are nothing but different ways of driving what is external back into the inwardness that spirit itself is, and it is only through this driving back, through this idealization or assimilation of what is external, that spirit becomes and exists. (*PhS Enc* §381 Zus)

Having discussed the inseparability of body and soul to his satisfaction, Hegel turns his attention to their distinction. Spirit and matter do not relate like two particular things relate to one another, but like universality relates to particularity, that is, like a concept relates to that whose concept it is: "In truth, the immaterial relates to the material, not like a particular to another particular, but like the truly universal that encompasses particularity relates to the particular" (*Enc* §389 Zus).

Spirit subsumes matter under itself. To say that spirit is matter's truth, or that matter has no truth without spirit,¹¹ is equivalent to saying that immateriality is that negation of materiality which is *implicit* in matter's concept. In the history of philosophy, religion, and science, spirit has been represented in turn as *noūs*, as light, as force, as god—and even as no-thing. For matter to have its own truth in spirit means, to use a Platonic expression, for matter to be in essence "the other of itself."¹² That is exactly what spirit's many forms of existence—as sentient and feeling soul, as thinking mind, free will, or ethical life—demonstrate: corporeity belongs to each of them, and they to corporeity. The Kehler manuscript of the oral commentary on this section (§389 Zus) is particularly enlightening in this regard:

We have mentioned here the relationship in which it is customary to conceive of the way in which body or matter relates to spirit.

We have mentioned that this is determined by Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, etc. on speculative grounds . . . The conception . . . that God mediates all . . . is the same. . . . One must expose the defective method of these representations . . . *We have therefore done away with this relationship, with this question about the connection between body and soul.* The corporeal has no truth for spirit, but its bearing is such that it¹³ presupposes an idealism and is unintelligible unless we learn to master this idealism. (*Enc* §389 Zus, MS Kehler; emphasis added)¹⁴

An example of this employment of “idealism” that is ubiquitous in Hegel’s texts is the meaning of development (*Entwicklung*), the self-induced motion that characterizes life as well as spirit. “Development” refers equally to living nature’s permanent self-motion and to spirit’s manifold guises of appropriation of the world. The stages of soul and of spirit proper that structure the *Philosophy of Spirit* are all instances of increasing idealization in the sense specified here. *Geist*, we may say, is synonymous with “idealizing activity.” This explains Hegel’s references to the soul as “the simple ideal life” of nature (*Enc* §389); to the content of the waking soul as its “ideal moment” (*Enc* §399); and to animal appetite (*tierische Begierde*) as the “idealism of object-being” (*Idealismus der Gegenständlichkeit*), by which external nature becomes accessible to animal subjectivity (*PhN Enc* §359 Zus).

The *Philosophy of Subjective Spirit* is an extensive study of this idealism. In the *Anthropology*, this idealizing activity is still under the spell of externality. Spirit here belongs to nature only potentially but has no life of its own: it cannot yet, to speak with Anaxagoras, “rule all things, that is, know.”¹⁵ In the sequel, the *Encyclopaedia* “Phenomenology” studies the next phase of this idealization, namely, the *apparent* disappearance of nature into conscious spirit. The subject matter of the *Encyclopaedia* “Psychology” is then the overcoming of both preceding types of idealization. Spirit here comes into its own by unifying its naturalness (the immediacy that characterizes the soul) with its immateriality—consciousness’s alienation from that naturalness. It is here for the first time that the object of study is the fully reflective mind.

Within this systematic framework, the role of the *Anthropology* in the philosophical science of spirit becomes clear. Its function is to demonstrate that being-soul is a comparatively simple case of material nature’s beginning to turn inward or self-relate. In logical terms, the first modes of existence of the soul are abstract, *Dasein*-like moments of spirit. This is why the fundamental notions at work in this treatise are comparatively abstract. The text is dominated by geographical and biological categories like climate, species, race, and life stage, and by physiological and psychological notions like irritability, sexuality, temperament, attention, and memory retention. What is being investigated here is the primal—both primitive and first—foundation of subsequent subject matter: the intelligent mind of subjective spirit, the

ethical life of objective spirit, and finally the aesthetic, religious, and philosophical self-knowing of spirit as absolute.

2. The Soul Begins as World-Soul (*kosmos zōon empsuchon*)

The *Anthropology*'s initial object, then, is the life implicit in nature or the world-soul. This is a subject matter that carries within it an essential contradiction. The natural world is extrinsicality par excellence, and yet its living forms are instances of natural inwardness. What is being investigated, therefore, are the external manifestations of that whose essential character is interiority. Keeping this paradox in mind goes a long way toward understanding the story that unfolds.

To begin with, the soul is a terrestrial phenomenon. It therefore has cosmic connections. It is made possible, as already explained in the *Philosophy of Nature*, by the "physical relationship of the celestial bodies" (*PhN Enc* §279 Zus).¹⁶ The world-soul is geographically distributed, conditioned by climate, and governed by terrestrial events. And just as the lesser and greater *Logic* prove that the abstract category of "being" must run into that of "determinate being," so here the generic life of the world-soul becomes increasingly determined, specified, and singularized as a multiplicity of living beings. The soul develops motions peculiar to itself: pulsations, rhythms, parthenogenesis, sexual differentiation, youth, maturity, and decay. Enduring through these most primitive stages of its existence, the soul eventually

reunites itself with itself by taking away the resistance opposed by its other . . . and by dissolving the latter into its own ideality. In this way, the soul has proceeded from being a merely *universal* and only *in-itself singularity* to being an *actual singularity for-itself*, and with that, it has proceeded to *sentience* [*Empfindung*]. (*Enc* §390 Zus)

In general terms, the sentience¹⁷ of live nature consists of its reaching out to and taking in the self-extrinsic natural systems that surround it. Understood in this way, "world-soul" refers to the whole of sentient or animal bodies. By thus sensually relating to others, these individuals develop the higher capacity to also sense themselves as sensing others. Hegel refers to this second-order sensing as "feeling," which always already entails self-feeling.

The natural soul or living body is, as it were, the performative proof of the logical concept of being-other-than-itself. Sentience—*Empfindung*: a finding of affections in the body—and feeling—*Gefühl*: a unification of those findings in "me"—become an awareness of all these affections as residing together in one virtual place: felt selfness (*Selbstischkeit*).¹⁸ The self-feeling soul is the natural prelude to the condition in which, through habituation, the individual takes possession of, fashions, and wills its body, making it into

a *human* body, “the artwork of the soul” (*Enc* §411). This is the foundation upon which conscious egoity rests.

At the onset of the investigation, however, “soul” must not be taken to refer to individuals (*Enc* §391), but to the universal soul-substance or organic life capable of differentiation into a multiplicity of souls. The soul is substance, as Aristotle established long ago, because substance does not denote the thinghood of things but their activity.¹⁹ Like all natural phenomena, the soul offers to the philosophical observer spatial and temporal features: a wealth of qualities (a. α , treated in *Enc* §§392–95) and (a. β) a series of transformations (*Enc* §§396–98). But unlike what happens with mechanical phenomena, the soul’s qualities and transformations are being reflected inward, so that in this “negation of the real, the real is at once also *conserved*, saved *virtualiter*, although it does not exist” (*Enc* §403 Anm). The first virtual content of the soul is sensations; the corresponding psychic activity is variously called by Hegel “sentient nature,” “spirit as sentience,” or simply “the sentient soul” (treated in a. γ : *Enc* §§399–402).

The *Anthropology* presents the phases of the soul’s increasing subjectivation as a logical sequence of successive self-differentiations. As in other contexts, Hegel understands necessary temporal sequences to be manifestations of logically necessary ones. The notion of an atemporal sequence, we may note here incidentally, is not a coquetry on Hegel’s part. We are all familiar with such sequences. Their paradigm is the inference from premises to conclusion in any valid syllogism: while *we* need time to draw conclusions, we also know that these do not follow *after* the premises but are already contained *in* them.

The account of the self-differentiations of the world-soul begins with the diversifications of Earth’s ecosystems:

Spirit in its substance, the natural soul, first lives symbiotically with the universal life of the planet, the difference of climates, the seasonal changeovers, the times of day and so on—a natural life that only surfaces in it partly in the form of murky moods. (*Enc* §392)

These beginnings are followed by an exposition of the biological diversifications of this world-soul, whose substance is nature, into animal species and their varieties, including mankind and its races, as they are determined by geological, geographic, and climatic conditions—in a word, by natural history. In the human species, these earliest conditionings of the soul also contribute to shaping the archaic, habitual, local dispositions and ways of life of peoples and native groups: souls as “local spirits” (*Lokalgeister*). In the end-phase of differentiation, these natural qualities become manifest as features of particular and singular souls: they are the temperaments, talents, and idiosyncrasies of close communities, families, and their individual members.

Hegel's account begins, therefore, with the abstractly universal concept of *Seele* as a hylomorphic "middle between, on the one hand, nature lying behind it, and on the other, the world of ethical freedom working itself out of natural spirit" (*Enc* §391 Zus). We reach the familiar territory of particular concrete dispositions, temperaments, and characters of human types only midway in this journey. Only at this point does it become appropriate to abandon talk of the soul as a merely natural substance and speak of it as emerging subjectivity: "The *universal soul as world-soul* must not be labeled at once as a subject because it is only universal *substance*, which only has its actual truth as *singularity*, subjectivity" (*Enc* §391).²⁰

As for the natural soul of humans, it displays species-specific, racial, familial, sexual, and even national (*völkisch*) features about which physical and cultural anthropology, psychology, and physiology have much to contribute—some of it drawn from reasoned observation, but much of it derived from fantasy and prejudice.

Whatever empirical science's often-changing and self-serving insights may be (and the Additions from the students' transcripts indicate that the "absolute professor" is willing to embrace a number of these), Hegel repeatedly reminds us that to speak of the naturalness of the soul is to do so from the perspective of its successors, namely consciousness, intelligence, and will. The natural soul cannot speak for itself, since it does not speak at all. Only consciousness can speak for and about the soul. We encounter in the Addition to §391 the *Anthropology's* second instance of the notion of unconscious soul in the guise of an adjective: *bewusstlos*; the first instance appears in the earlier Addition to *Enc* §389 in form of a substantivized adjective: *die Bewusstlosigkeit der Seele*. Like other notions in key systematic positions, the full meaning of unconscious being is attained only from a subsequent perspective—here, the vantage point of consciousness. It is the conscious mind which, including the capacity to self-distinguish from its own object, understands the soul as a prior form of its own existence, its own mere being-there: *das Dasein der Seele*. While cosmic and terrestrial influences; geographical, historical, and racial peculiarities; familial propensities; and sexual determinacy—the contents of the first ten sections of the *Anthropology*—must be considered natural surroundings from the perspective of consciousness, they are not mere surroundings for the natural soul itself: "These natural determinations . . . are *for consciousness* natural objects, to which soul as such does not relate as to externals" (*Enc* §391). Immersed in nature, the soul cannot distinguish itself from nature's externality—indeed, the soul has no self from which to distinguish what is external to it. Hegel even draws attention to the fact that this constellation implies the uncanny mutual foreignness between the soul and its conscious successor form. For the phenomenologist of consciousness, and more so for the philosopher of mind, the soul is the object of a study undertaken for the sake of the larger project of grasping spirit that is free.

Yet despite these words of caution and the subtlety of the distinctions drawn, some of Hegel's recorded pronouncements on the relation of natural and spiritual traits in human types appear uncharacteristically rudimentary and at times, as shown in the next chapter, facile and crude. On the one hand, for example, Hegel is recorded as dismissing Africans' "indolence," Asians' "restlessness," and Europeans' "energy" (which is here credited with having singlehandedly "secured them the rule of the world," *Enc* §393 Zus) as merely natural traits of the soul and thus irrelevant to the freedom, that is, the right of humankind (*Recht der Menschheit*). On the other hand, the Additions brim over with Hegel's ideological explanations and after-the-fact justifications of global power relations that become connected with natural history in ways more reminiscent of early French climatological anthropologies than of German dialectics. To make matters more complex, each of these Additions also contains trenchant criticisms and straightforward rejections of self-serving racial theories of European exploiters of others' capacity for work. We will never know which of these Additions reflect the transcribers' and which contain Hegel's own words.²¹ What we do know is that we cannot ignore the Additions altogether when making sense of the main text.

The expression "world-soul" refers in this context, as we have seen, to live matter. In this "darkest" of states the soul does not feel, desire, or recoil from, let alone understand the cosmic and geographical influences it is exposed to, but simply exists in sympathy with them. It is affected only insofar as its environs are immediately modes of its being; "murky moods" are its only contents. However impalpable, cosmic influences on plant and animal life are undeniable, since living things' existence and survival depend on this symbiotic relation with the universe. In the *Philosophy of Nature*, under the heading "Physics of Universal Individuality," we already find the continuity of universal mechanics with cosmic relations and terrestrial life²² explained in the following way:

This physical relationship of the celestial bodies together with their mechanical relations is the cosmos [*das Kosmische*]. The latter is the foundation, the wholly universal life [*das ganz allgemeine Leben*] with which the whole of living nature is symbiotic . . . But . . . the stronger [individuality] becomes, the least effective is the power of sidereal forces. What follows from that universal symbiosis is that we sleep and wake, that we are in different moods at daybreak and in the evening. (*PhN Enc* §279 Zus)

It may follow from this symbiosis, for example, that some patterns of illness may coincide with lunar phases, that weather fluctuations may impact the sensitivity of scars, or perhaps that *luna* may influence our lunatics (see *PhN Enc* §279 Zus; and *Enc* §392 Zus). Yet, Hegel warns, the importance of the cosmic relation can be vastly inflated: "In recent times there has been a lot

of talk about the *cosmic, sidereal, telluric* life of human beings. The animal lives essentially in this sympathy" (*Enc* §392 Anm). In human communities, however, only superstition and weakness of mind expose individuals to those elemental influences.²³ Only in undeveloped conditions do people who believe the world to be "a mirror of spirit" attempt to "explain spirit out of the world" (*Enc* §392 Zus). Welcome as it may be that good vintages follow the sighting of comets (the former being even more welcome than the latter, Hegel adds),²⁴ the fact of the matter is that a possible connection between the two events would have to be corroborated by the atmospheric and geological sciences. In animal species, the stronger their individualization is, the less relevant are sidereal and terrestrial influences. As for human beings, the more encompassing their cultural formation (*Bildung*) is, the less they let themselves be determined by natural forces. Of course, physical influences do remain long after we have taken leave of our natural state, but they carry little meaning: "Neither does world history depend upon the solar system's revolutions, nor do the destinies of individuals depend upon the planets' positions," because "terrestrial states of affairs . . . though not without influence . . . are meaningless for spirit as such" (*Enc* §392 Anm).

We may therefore acknowledge, without making too much of it, that Earth's axial tilt or its daily rotations continue to impact the soul's generic but also individual existence. In individuals, this impact is recognizable in the illnesses and regressions, in the general "depression of self-conscious life" that, Hegel believes, accompanies the first attainment of selfhood, that feeling of self which eventually becomes the pivotal trait of full-blown individuality (*Enc* §407). Cosmic effects on our species show through the wondrous capacities of individuals from peoples who are more attuned to nature and less advanced in freedom than those whose wonder they excite: visionary prognostications, magical knowledge, action at a distance. Magical capacities and conceptions are an integral part of the phylogenetic and ontogenetic development of the human soul. Among cultures immersed in nature, magical capacities can be highly developed. The shamans of the Mongols and West Indians are one example, but, as we read in the *Philosophy of History*, African cultures were already famous in antiquity for producing individuals with these extraordinary endowments: "Already Herodotus . . . called Negroes magicians" (*PhGesch* W 12:122). In this lecture, however, the stress is on different aspects of early humanity's attunement with nature: early humans' feelings of being the highest powers vis-à-vis other natural forces, the absence of conceptions of one divinity and of a generic notion of right, and the extrinsic projection of human power in the fetish. In the *Anthropology*, however, Hegel gives us a sober reminder that there is something of the savage in each of us: even modern individuals can feel in their wounds imminent weather changes "of which the barometer still shows nothing" (*Enc* §392 Zus).

All told, belief in the strong bonding of human emotions with cosmic motions is symptomatic of a spirit that is not yet sure of itself. Lest some

may think that Hegel singles out non-European cultures as illustrations of spirit's primitive dependence on nature (a perspective that is sometimes being argued), it is worth pointing out that he also chooses the Greek and Roman civilizations to illustrate a collectively "weak spirit" that is in the thrall of magical and zodiacal powers:

That which determines the organism in these ways is of significance as well for weak spirits and is sensed by them as an influence. Even entire peoples, the Greeks and the Romans, let their decisions depend upon natural phenomena that seemed to them connected to meteorological variations. They famously sought counsel in state affairs not only from priests, but also from the entrails and the feeding of animals. (*Enc* §392 Zus)

In battle, Greek generals consulted oracles, and Roman augurs interpreted natural signs in order to divine whether attack or retreat was called for. They inspected the bowels of slaughtered beasts in order to discern their soldiers' courage—that individual "feeling of physical strength" (*Enc* §392 Zus) required by ancient warfare. From the visible disposition of animals' viscera, warlords derived the invisible disposition of their men—their having guts, as it were. Yet, Hegel adds, not only ancient peoples but even some modern scholars strive to turn cosmology and astrology into sciences, becoming hopelessly caught in a dead end:

The attempt to raise this symbiosis of the soul with the whole universe to the status of supreme object of the science of spirit is . . . an utter mistake. And in fact, the essential activity of spirit consists precisely in its rising above its captivity in mere natural life . . . Thus, in spirit the universal life of nature is only a wholly subordinate moment; cosmic and telluric powers are being dominated by spirit and can only induce in it an insignificant mood. (*Enc* §392 Zus)

Magicians, scientists, rational philosophers, and palm readers alike agree that *natura non facit saltus* ("nature does not make jumps"). Holding on to this true but abstract principle alone, astrologers and cosmologists will continue to offer, without proof, wild explanations of human behavior and individual fate. According to Hegel, however, they do not bear the burden of proving these explanations. The burden of proving them wrong falls squarely on the science of spirit: "The content of astrology must be rejected as superstition; yet it is the task of science to provide the specific ground of this rejection" (*Enc* §392 Zus). Parts of this science are provided by the study of the human soul expounded in the next sections of the *Anthropology*.

Chapter 4



Animal Life, or *das tierische Subjekt*

1. The Strange Case of the Human Soul

Following upon the treatment of natural spirit's symbiotic connection with the geophysical history of Earth, the *Anthropology* embarks on an extensive account of the racial, ethnic, familial, and individual patterns of diversification of the specifically human soul (*Enc* §§ 392–95). Consistent with eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Earth sciences, Hegel's explanation of the prodigious variability of life forms on our planet relies heavily on theories of early continental drifts and geological cataclysms (*Enc* § 392). The self-diremptions of natural spirit that are driven by cosmic and terrestrial forces eventually also come to include differentiations occurring in the natural history of the human soul. Hegel's comparatively succinct discussion in the main texts of these sections is supplemented by copious oral commentaries on the spiritual diversity that allegedly accompanies processes of physical differentiation.

The treatment of the soul of our species, the principal subject matter of the transcribed Additions to § 392 and § 393, presupposes the transformational theories of life forms championed by Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744–1829) and Gottfried R. Treviranus (1776–1837).¹ The Addition to § 393 shows that Hegel is not in the least concerned with justifying the natural-historical, profoundly materialistic outlook of these theories. He appears to embrace them as representing a scientific consensus that is fully compatible with his own account of the origins and modes of existence of natural spirit. More interestingly yet, Hegel is recorded as launching into a radical rebuttal of ideological distortions of scientific and philosophical anthropologies, denouncing in particular self-serving explanations of racial differences conceived for the sake of geopolitical and ultimately economic ends. Yet we also find in the same Addition, among some brilliant insights, some astonishingly crude (Marx would have called them vulgar-materialistic) claims of a strong correlation between physical surroundings and the spiritual characteristics of human groups, characteristics which are meant to include cultural behaviors and capacities that go well beyond the natural features of the soul. Hegel's crudest claims pertain to the discussion of the Ethiopian (i.e., African) race, which,

while capable of receiving education (*Bildung*), is nonetheless said to display “no internal drive” toward it. In its present historical state, this race apparently does not rise “to the feeling of the personhood of the human being” and possesses a “wholly slumbering spirit” that is disinclined from self-development—all of which Hegel explains in a purely associative way: the African spirit “corresponds to the compact, *undifferentiated* mass of the African land” (*Enc* §393 Zus).

As significant as Hegel’s recorded commentaries are, they are often at loggerheads with the main argument laid out in his own hand, that is, with the main text of the sections. Taken together, the main texts and recorded Additions constitute a remarkable example of the double tongue of which modern philosophy is capable. In general, while Hegel’s main texts make the convincing case that natural history is irrelevant to moral philosophy’s concerns, and that natural disposition is irrelevant to personhood, these Additions, together with the recordings of an infamous passage on Africa from the *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, seem to presuppose ancient political categories like the Aristotelian “inferior” and “superior” to characterize the natural diversity among races.² Hegel even goes so far as to offer generic and general claims like this: “In his undifferentiated, compact unity, the African has not yet reached [the] distinction of himself as individual from his essential universality.” (Among other considerations, addressing this reproach to only one race is particularly bizarre, considering the fact that from the perspective of a history of spirit, this lack of self-distinction would still apply to most people on Earth.) The negative focus on African humanity is probably best captured by the blanket comment: “The Negro represents . . . natural man in his whole savageness and irrepressibility; . . . there is nothing assonant with human personhood [*nichts an das Menschliche Anklingende*] in this character” (*PhGesch* W 12:122). In contexts like this, *das Menschliche* is better rendered as “human personhood” in order to preserve the moral connotation implied in the German *Mensch* but not necessarily in the English “man” or “human.” This is important, as shown below, because Hegel’s use of *das Menschliche*, *die Menschengattung* (for short, *die Gattung*), and cognate expressions demonstrates that not even his crudest and most uninformed judgments about Africa³ imply that its native inhabitants belong to a different species. This, however, had been a serious bone of contention among scholars since early modernity. Hegel’s emphasis lies throughout on the fact that African peoples, insofar as they have not yet been either Islamicized or Christianized, are still completing the transition from the natural to the political condition that is, after all, the defining transition of mankind as a whole.

If truth be told, most of Hegel’s arguments in the bona fide text of the *Anthropology* are consistent with his theory of world history, according to which human history is a progressive and universal abandonment of our natural subjection, a species-wide “progress in the consciousness of freedom—a progress that we have to recognize in its necessity” (*PhGesch* W 12:32). Yet

the Addition to *Enc* §393, and more so the recorded lectures on the races of mankind, not only suggest but state explicitly that some human groups display no natural disposition to attaining the unnatural end of freedom. Thus, while all mankind is a historical candidate for right and freedom, some of its varieties might have to be dragged recalcitrantly along in the maelstrom of history. Despite the different theoretical context, what inevitably comes to mind here is Rousseau's emphatic statement on membership in the social compact: "anyone who refuses to obey the general will shall be compelled to do so by the entire body; which means nothing else than that he will be forced to be free."⁴ Indeed, it would not be exaggerating to maintain that Rousseauian conceptuality is pervasive in these sections of the *Anthropology*. This even includes Rousseau's Montesquieuan assumption that climate is an almost infallible predictor of cultural destiny. In book 3, chapter 8 of the *Social Contract* we read: "Freedom, not being a fruit of all the climes, is not within the reach of all peoples. The more one meditates upon this principle established by Montesquieu, the more one senses its truth."⁵

According to Hegel's Africa lectures, the human telos of freedom from natural subjection may even take the form of a historically necessary though provisional enslavement of parts of mankind—a widely shared sentiment among sections of the (non-African) educated public in Hegel's time:

Negroes are led into slavery by the Europeans and sold in America. Their fate is nevertheless almost worse in their own country, where absolute slavery is equally present . . . Indeed it is key for the [African] kings to sell their enemy prisoners or even their own subjects, and [European-American] slavery has therefore roused more human personhood [*mehr Menschliches*] among the Negroes. (*PhGesch* W 12:128–29)

Hegel is echoing here a recurrent theme in the economic and travel literature of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, namely, the "advantageous" features of enslavement in the colonies if compared with enslavement in the countries of origin. In his 1732 memoir, for example, John Barbot (or Jean Barbeau), who plied the slave trade for the French Royal African Company, expresses widely held views of African slavery in words similar to Hegel's:

This barbarous usage . . . makes it appear, that the fate of such as are bought and transported from the coast to America . . . is less deplorable, than that of those who end their days in their native country . . . Not to mention the inestimable advantage they may reap, of becoming Christians, and saving their souls. (Barbot 1732, 1–13)

Since Hegel thinks of the social organizations prevailing in Africa as mixed forms of natural state and despotism, and thus representative of "absolute

and thorough wrong [*Unrecht*]” (*PhGesch* W 12:129), any stage in the Hobbesian process of *exeundum e statu naturae* (“having to leave the state of nature”) counts for him as a merely relative wrong in humanity’s inexorable march toward consciousness of its freedom (and thereby eventually toward freedom itself). In this perspective, far from being the exclusive destiny of particular races, slavery has been a fixture of human societies ever since the flourishing of ancient civilizations, as illustrated by the fact that “we find slavery [*Sklaverei*] even in the Greek and Roman state, just like bondage [*Leibeigenschaft*] in the most recent times” (*PhGesch* W 12:129). Apparently, slavery in a modern state like the American nation, Hegel muses, is for the slave—in a way that “absolute” enslavement in Africa is not—a “progressing [away] from a merely singular, sensual existence, a moment of education [*Erziehung*], a manner of participation in a higher ethical life and in the formation [*Bildung*] that is connected with it” (*PhGesch* W 12:129). Just like the education of children—the generational recurrence of *exeundum*—so the elevation of races and peoples who, Hegel assumes, still dwell in the savage condition cannot and should not happen at once: “Slavery is in and for itself wrong because the essence of the human being is freedom, yet the human being must first mature towards freedom” (*PhGesch* W 12:129). Characteristically for his own “mature” thinking (having long since abandoned the revolutionary fervor of his Tübingen years), Hegel draws the conclusion here that “the gradual eradication of slavery is something more adequate and correct [*etwas Angemesseneres und Richtigeres*] than its sudden abolition” (*PhGesch* W 12:129).

This perspective from the *Philosophy of History* is entirely consistent with Hegel’s discussion of historical slavery as a worldwide institution in the *Outlines of the Philosophy of Right*. The main points of that discussion are, first, that the natural condition knows no right; second, that being-human entails being a natural entity together with its concept, whereby this concept is being progressively realized through the development (*Ausbildung*) of body and mind; third, that an ethical world in which slavery is rightful or legitimate is one in which spirit has only just attained consciousness, but no self-consciousness; fourth, that the dialectic of consciousness and self-consciousness triggers in such a developing ethical world the struggle for recognition between lordship and bondage;⁶ and fifth, that the one-sided justification and the one-sided rejection of slavery form an antinomy that altogether disregards the historical-developmental character of the human species. All these points are made in the *Philosophy of Right*’s §57 and its Remark. The Addition to this section concludes: “Slavery falls in the transition from the naturalness of human beings to the truly ethical condition; it falls in a world where a wrong is still right. Here, the wrong *has validity* [gilt] and is in place with equal necessity” (*RPh* §57 Zus).



In current Anglo-American debates on race and racism in Western thought, and in Hegel's philosophy in particular,⁷ advocates of the centrality of the idea of race and of the ideology of racism in the history of Western philosophy tend to conflate Hegel's own written arguments, the transcribed oral commentaries, and the philosopher's surmised personal views. This is understandable, particularly when the main text's claim that racial variability is a function of geophysical variations seems to issue effortlessly in ideas like that of the greater internal differentiation and thus the creativity of Caucasian peoples, as compared to the lack of internal differentiation and thus obtuseness of African peoples. The well-known fact that neither the oral Additions nor the extant texts of the lectures can be directly attributed to Hegel does not imply, of course, that the commentaries they contain, and the judgments that embellish or mar them, are mere products of students' and editors' malicious imagination. These judgments, or a subset of them, may well mirror Hegel's opinions. Yet scholarly criteria would seem to require caution in attributing the merely recorded views to the philosopher himself, and even more importantly in presenting them as the underlying or authentic import of the philosophy of spirit—especially when they are demonstrably incompatible with the arguments in the texts published by the author or written in his own hand. It is this incompatibility that most undermines some contemporary interpretations of what are indeed loathsome claims from the transcribed texts. This applies especially to interpretations that single out these claims as the underlying glue of Hegel's philosophical anthropology, of his philosophy of history, and, by extension, of his juridical and political philosophy. One prominent advocate of this reading summarizes it as follows: "Hegel's Eurocentrism is structured by Hegel's understanding of race," and "[Hegel's] appeal to race . . . functions in his hands as a caste system, thereby rendering his philosophy of history arbitrary and so devoid of reason in spite of the fact that that was precisely what he did not want it to be."⁸ To make matters worse, in the contemporary literature aimed at demonstrating the racial or even racist foundations of Hegel's philosophies of history and right, passages are sometimes quoted in mutilated form, resulting in severe distortions of their meaning—as when, for example, one of Hegel's remarks on peoples' (*Völker*) consciousness of freedom is limited to quoting the sentence:⁹ "Whole continents, Africa and the Orient, have never had this idea [of freedom], and are without it still" (*PhS Enc* §482 Anm). Yet Hegel's passage does not single out two continents (let alone two races) as lacking familiarity with the idea of freedom. Hegel's point here is more historical than geographical, and it is certainly not racial, as the continuation of the paragraph demonstrates. Here it is in its entirety:

Whole continents, Africa and the Orient, have never had this idea [of freedom], and are without it still. The Greeks and the Romans, Plato and Aristotle, even the Stoics have not had it; they knew by contrast only that the human being is actually free through birth (as Athenian,

Spartan citizen, and so on) or through strength of character, education, through philosophy (the sage is free even as slave and in chains). (*PhS Enc* §482 Anm)

Other eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholars of the nascent sciences of *anthropos*, principal among them Johann F. Blumenbach, continue to suffer a fate worse than Hegel's at the hands of contemporary commentators—despite their being far less ambivalent than Hegel in their assessment of the universal, moral, and intellectual capacities of every branch of mankind (as shown below).

This chapter aims at revising some of these contemporary understandings by highlighting profound divergences among anthropological conceptions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It offers a closer reading not just of relevant textual material from Hegel's work, but also of some of his main sources such as Blumenbach, in contrast with other theories of race preceding and following Hegel's time: Isaac de la Peyrère, Henry Home, Samuel Morton, and James Hunt. Accounts of a linear development from early modern anthropologies of race to antiabolitionist racism and finally to twentieth-century genocidal policies simply do not withstand the test of scholarship. In the words of one scholar critical of these linear accounts: "Simply having a concept of race does not a racist make, nor does the attempt to account for racial differences. Neither does the rejection of the concept of race necessarily imply anti-racism . . . Moreover, negative value judgments concerning various cultures or cultural practices, however ill-informed and arrogant . . . , do not automatically amount to racism."¹⁰ In keeping with this perspective, a summary of the racial classifications presented in the *Addition to Enc* §393 is followed here by a discussion of the wider scientific and political context in which and against which Hegel develops his arguments about the human race (*Gattung*) and the human races (*Rassen*). The chapter highlights the contrast between modern theories committed to anthropological universalism—including Hegel's—and the antiuniversalism implicit in some seventeenth- and eighteenth-century conceptions, which eventually resurfaced in the second half of the nineteenth century, this time adorned with all manner of empirical "findings" that anticipated the dreadful racial policies of the next century.

2. One Genealogy, Many Races

The main text of §393 describes the breakdown (*Zerfall*) of the world-soul into a plurality of "natural spirits" triggered by antediluvian geophysical occurrences and eventually resulting in the diversity of the human races. The Americas, Africa, Asia, and Europe are the principal Earth zones resulting from the earliest cataclysms; hence Americans, Negroes or Ethiopes, Mongols, and Caucasians are today the most general or basic races of mankind.

Of course, these races split in turn into subgroups due to the natural history that for millennia has subjected our species either to isolation or to mass migrations. Even the basic attributes of the principal races, those that reflect the most stubborn features of their environment, are therefore subject to countless variations. Hegel takes up each continent and its “race” in turn.

Native Americans inhabit what appears to be the most recent result of tectonic movements. It is this, and not their recent discovery by European explorers and entrepreneurs, that lies behind the expression “the new world.” By migrating to the Americas, the old European world may actually be giving itself a chance for renewal. Reason (displaying here, one is tempted to add, more cynicism than cunning) allows this process to unfold in such a way that “the native peoples . . . succumb” (*Enc* §393 Zus). Hegel knows enough about native American societies to admit that at the time of the continent’s discovery, some displayed “a fair degree” of organization: this is not, “however, comparable to European culture and it has disappeared together with the original inhabitants” (*Enc* §393 Zus). As for the incomparable European culture that, rather than interacting with alien polities and ways of life, altogether obliterates them, Hegel describes the instruments of its success with a blunt facticity that denies the conquering culture all claims to epic heroism: “The Caribs of earlier times are almost entirely extinct. These savages die out when brought into contact with brandy and guns” (*Enc* §393 Zus). One commentary from the *Philosophy of History* is actually even more incisive. It is made by Hegel in the context of an explanation of the non-Hellenic origins of Greek civilization: “Thus we see here [in the archaic history of Greece] a colonization by cultivated peoples who were already ahead of the Greeks in civilization [*Bildung*]; but one cannot compare this colonization with that by the English in North America, as these have not mingled with the natives but rather displaced them, while the colonists of Greece mixed together imported and autochthonous elements” (*PhGesch* W 12:281).

Decimation and displacement are, then, the raw historical instruments by which world spirit advances its actualization on a global scale—instruments that strike readers of the *Philosophy of Right* as rather incongruous for a world agent understood, as in that work, as reason in action, battling the caprice and irrationality of mere fate:

World history is . . . not the mere tribunal of power, that is, the abstract and irrational necessity of blind fate, but, because [spirit] is in and for itself reason . . . , world history is . . . the necessary development of the moments of reason . . . the exposition and actualization of universal spirit. (*RPh* §342).

It is not just from a Carib’s perspective that one is hard-pressed not to think of brandy and guns as falling under the category of “abstract and irrational necessity.” Be this as it may, Hegel’s factual assessment of this historical

dynamics is hard to dismiss: whether conquered by Spain and Portugal, or subjected to Jesuit paternalism, or destroyed by the French and the English, “the Americans are obviously not in a condition to assert themselves against the Europeans. These will therefore initiate a new culture in the land they have conquered from the natives” (*Enc* §393 Zus).

As for the inhabitants of Africa, the Addition continues, the continent’s characteristic geological feature, “compact highlands,” has blocked them since immemorable times from access to the sea and hence from physical and cultural commerce. With a remarkable lack of dialectical mediation and under the heavy influence of Montesquieuan thought, Hegel construes this closed-in geography as the physical counterpart of cultural and psychological undifferentiatedness. Africa’s native ethnicities are said to be culturally apathetic and uninventive “nations of children” (*Enc* §393 Zus) whose religiosity, to choose but one example, still confuses the sign with the signified: Africans worship their fetishes as if they were themselves gods.¹¹ These nations hardly question social orders and time-honored personal subjection: “They are being bought and let themselves be bought without any reflection on whether this be right or not” and their communities are governed “by the most dreadful despotism” (*Enc* §393 Zus).¹² Despite its comparatively uniform nature, we are further informed, the natural soul of the African is subject to swings between extremes: individuals who are mostly good-natured act at times with appalling cruelty. Yet even this slumbering soul is capable of rising to spiritual freedom because, being a specifically human soul, it participates in reason. In Hegel’s perspective, this is proven by the logical, hence universal necessity with which spirit develops, as this development is driven, we may recall, by the urge to know itself. Yet the rational nature of the African soul also finds empirical corroboration, namely, in a momentous event in modern history. This is the founding of the state of Haiti—a historical true-making (*Bewahrheitung*) of that logical necessity of spirit.

That the corroboration of logic by experience is a measure of the strength of any philosophy of reality has been made explicit in the Introduction to the *Encyclopaedia*:

[Philosophy’s] content is the *actual* [die *Wirklichkeit*]. The immediate consciousness of this content we call *experience* . . . Since philosophy differs only in form from other ways in which this one-and-only content becomes conscious, philosophy’s accord with actuality and experience is necessary. As a matter of fact, this accord can be considered at the very least an external touchstone of the truth of a philosophy. (*L Enc* §6)

In the present context, the history of state-founding in Haiti provides the idea of universal development with just such an external touchstone. It was, after all, Africans and not Europeans who founded there a nation-state structured

according to “Christian principles.” For Hegel, a state founded on “Christian principles” is one that displays a trinitarian power structure: the Legislative, the Judicial, and the Executive. For Hegel, this threefold structure of what is otherwise a singular unit characterizes the workings of reason in the world.¹³ Thus the former slaves of Saint Domingue, Haiti’s African founders, have demonstrated that they are full participants in reason.¹⁴ Moreover, Brazil, as Hegel has learned from an Englishman (though he could have referred to the more extensive case studies by Blumenbach, of which more below), is home to many “Negro physicians, artists, clergymen, and craftsmen,” a fact that prompts his condescending recognition of Africans’ adeptness at “acquiring European proficiencies” (*Enc* §393 Zus, Kehler MS).¹⁵

On account of its physical and spiritual features, Asia is a paradigm of “unmediated opposition.” This is ostensibly demonstrated by the nonfortuitous connection between its geophysical contrasts of high plateaus and deep valleys on the one hand, and, on the other, Asian peoples’ alternation between epoch-making invasions and ransacking, for which Hegel uses the centuries-old analogy of “colossal locust swarms,”¹⁶ and their opposite tendency to dull quietude and indifference. He even illustrates the latter by a Mongol disposition to “petty pedantry”—perhaps an attempt at explaining the legendary intricacies of Asian bureaucracies.¹⁷

Given this explanatory framework, it is not surprising to find Hegel declaring in the end that the physical geography of the Mediterranean basin is responsible for its inhabitants’ inclination to most constructive attitudes and ways of life. The so-called Caucasian soul unites the African soul’s attunement with nature with the Asian soul’s antagonism against it. Though Hegel does not state this explicitly, one may construe the logic of these three races’ relations to be such that Caucasians enjoy the advantage of a dialectical identity of sorts, namely a unification of African identity and Asian difference. Thus, Caucasian peoples’ cultures are expressions of a natural spirit endowed with an advanced internal differentiation, making them most willing and able to determine and transform their own ways of life. Unsurprisingly, then, the Caucasian eventually “brings forth world history” (*Enc* §393 Zus).

The first internal differentiation of the Caucasian (or more precisely, Eurasian) race yields the two subgroups called Western Asiatic and European. Through historical-religious developments that this Addition leaves unspecified, these two constituents of the Caucasian race have come to correspond to the Islamic and Christian cultures, respectively.

At this point in the text the naturalistic tenor of Hegel’s commentary, with its pretensions to explain culture and psychology through large-scale geophysics, is abandoned altogether. Hegel injects a healthy dose of history—not natural but spiritual history—into the narrative. Geography recedes in the prehistorical past, and culture, primarily the religious culture that binds humans together through a bond with an imagined divine, becomes the primary explanatory tool of cultural features and traditional political structures.

With regard to Western Asiatic Caucasians we are told, for example, that

in Mohammedanism, the narrow-minded principle of the Jews [i.e., the principle that the universal sublime is particular to the Israelites—AdL] is overcome . . . And neither is God represented, like in East Asia, as existing in an immediately sensuous way,¹⁸ but is rather understood as *one* infinite power rising above all the multiplicity of the world. (*Enc* §393 Zus)

It is now clearly no longer the physical terrain but the cultural soil that allows for the particular character of a people to flourish or decline. Among Caucasians the “Arab character,” being most attuned to radically sublime monotheism, is capable of complete indifference toward everything finite, even its own finite suffering. This culture produces a character “as generous with its own life as with its material goods; to this day Arab bravery and beneficence deserve our recognition” (*Enc* §393 Zus).¹⁹ As participants in a religion of the sublime, Mohammed’s followers are free from the worldly caste structures that are prevalent in East Asia. Among Muslims, as among all other world-historical peoples, political structures reflect religious consciousness, or religious self-understanding provides a blueprint for the political life. Since only the divinity is recognized by Muslims as being supreme, they cannot acknowledge a supreme authority on Earth. They respect and serve a plurality of chieftains, warlords, princes, caliphs and their councils, but none of these is the Emperor-God. On the other hand, the God of Islam is only an abstract universal. It is an internally undifferentiated, nonorganic unity. It is abstract greatness itself or (in a pure Parmenidean sense) the One Itself. This is why the caliphate may well be the political organization most suitable to Islamic civilizations. Absolute power belongs only to God, so that the caliphate, a federalism of polities led by a multiplicity of worldly rulers, is neither despotic after Far Eastern models, nor articulated in separate but equal powers in the Western European manner.

From the intellectualistic abstractness of this faith follow both the splendid and the fearsome features of Islamic culture. Hegel is an admirer of Muslims’ “magnificent aloofness with regard to subjective, finite ends,” but he finds the sublimity of their motives alarming:²⁰

On the other hand, they also lounge forward in the pursuit of just these ends with unbridled impetus, ends that lack all universality because here the universal has not yet achieved immanent differentiation. In this way there arise among them, together with the most noble dispositions, supreme revengefulness and duplicity. (*Enc* §393 Zus)

By contrast, the God of the Christianized Caucasians is an internally differentiated, concrete universal. Their representation of the divine is trinitarian: it

is revealed as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost at once. As their religion, so their political consciousness: the sovereign state acquires the form of a dynamic arrangement of three distinct powers. And while the universality of the state is articulated in particular powers, the particular interests of the citizenry are determined by the universality of the state. The development of universality into particulars and the rise of particularity to the universal are of course part of Hegel's definition of "self-conscious reason," which is invested here without further ado with the role of a "principle of European spirit" (*Enc* §393 Zus). European civilizations develop in their people a sort of rational confidence (*das Zutrauen*) with which they feel able and entitled to alter the world so that reason may recognize itself in it:

The European spirit posits the world over against itself, emancipates itself from it, and then sublates this opposition . . . Hence an infinite urge for knowledge predominates here that is foreign to the other races. The European is interested in the world . . . he wants to cognize it . . . to behold genus, law, universality, thought, inward rationality in the wordly particulars . . . He subjects the external world to his ends with an energy that has secured him the mastery of the world . . . and the state represents in Europe more or less the unfolding and realization, through rational institutions, of the freedom reclaimed from a despot's arbitrary will. (*Enc* §393 Zus)

Reason is thus best able to "more or less" unfold in the fertile ground of the soul-type that is prevalent among Christianized Caucasians, a subsection of a race that has become adept at transforming despotic caprice into rational freedom.

Having noted the atypically rudimentary character of some of Hegel's pronouncements on the connection between the physical surroundings and spiritual characteristics of human groups, it is appropriate now to also pay attention to his voicing, in the same Addition, an uncompromising denunciation of Europeans' colonial and imperial attempts at justifying the subjection and exploitation of other human groups.

Aside from the authorship issues pertaining to the *Encyclopaedia's* Additions, light may be shed on the apparent internal inconsistencies of these texts by relating them to a pivotal quarrel in the early history of anthropology, in whose context Hegel stakes out his position. This is the enduring debate between monogenists and polygenists—between advocates of a single-couple origin of mankind and promoters of multiple-couples origins.

Before launching into his already-discussed ruminations on Europeans' purported thirst for knowledge and Africans' alleged apathy regarding their self-cultivation, Hegel notes that historically and philosophically uninformed scientists hope to validate the spiritual superiority of one race over another by tracing their origins back to separate ancestors. Some even hope to ground

the moral dimension of personhood on these allegedly natural, hence prehistorical, and hence merely conjectural differences in origin.²¹ The real aim of these ideologues is to provide a naturalistic justification of the treatment of parts of humanity as beasts of burden at the hands of another part:

The merely natural-historical [*historische*]²² question whether all human races began from *one* couple or from several does not interest us in philosophy. Some have attributed importance to this question because through the assumption of a descent from several couples, they hoped to explain the spiritual superiority of one human species over the other, nay, even to prove human beings to be so different by nature in their spiritual capacities that some could justifiably be dominated like animals. (*Enc* §393 Zus)

But these ideologues' attempts to ground moral questions on real or imagined genealogies only reveal their fundamental ignorance about the nature of right and freedom:

From origins one can never derive any ground for humans' right or lack of right to freedom and power. The human person [*der Mensch*] is in itself rational; therein lies the possibility of all humans' equality in right—and the nullity of rigid distinctions²³ between kinds of humanity with and without right. (*Enc* §393 Zus)

Since humanity is “in itself rational,” participating in reason—and this implies living and thriving in rational political contexts—is a logical necessity for the species as such. The only necessity intrinsic in racial differences lies in Earth's historical and geographical dynamics; the teleological necessity of the attainment of freedom remains unaffected by natural circumstances. Ideologues and apologists will look in vain for the natural origins of right or for physiological dispositions to freedom, since right and freedom affirm themselves precisely when nature becomes silent.

Hegel, however, does not limit himself to declaring the irrelevance of genealogical hypotheses to the moral history of the species. The monogenist hypothesis appears to him rather incontrovertible, while polygenist theories strike him as lacking in clarity, realism, and internal consistency. In his pre-critical essay “Of the Different Races of Human Beings” (1775), Kant had already settled this question (with a terseness missing from Hegel's cogitations) with the help of French science and Occam's razor:

Buffon's rule that animals generating fertile offspring together . . . belong to one and the same physical species . . . [is] simply the definition of . . . natural species. . . . According to this concept, all human beings . . . belong to one and the same natural species . . . Of this . . .

one can only adduce a single natural cause, namely, that they all belong to a single stem . . . In the first case [i.e., monogenism], human beings belong not only to one and the same species but also to one family; in the second [polygenism], they are similar to one another but not related, and one would have to assume many local creations [*Lokalschöpfungen*]; an opinion that unnecessarily multiplies the number of causes. (Kant 1969f, 429–30)

Hegel seems to be entirely reliant on Kant's perspective. His discounting of the polygenist hypothesis is not only based on its irrelevance for the history of spirit but is also rooted in this hypothesis's *prima facie* incompatibility with the known natural history of mankind. Due to Hegel's thorough familiarity with the scientific, religious, and political controversies on species and races that had been gathering force on both sides of the Atlantic since the sixteenth century, the strength of his position can be best assessed in the light of this context.



In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the perceived need for a justification of European expansionism into overseas domains, as well as the increasing evidence of a remarkable diversity of human types, prompted European scholars to question the validity of the Scriptures' monogenist stories of human origins. Religious authorities reacted by pronouncing racial and ethnic variety to be the product of environmentally induced physical diversifications of one and the same created species. Polygenism officially became a heretical doctrine with a 1512 bull issued by Pope Julius II: by papal verdict, the newly discovered aboriginal peoples of the Americas become direct descendants of Adam and Eve. As for the remarkable ethnic varieties reported by missionaries, explorers, and sundry conquerors, the church declared that the generations of Noah's descendants as reported in Holy Scripture spanned a long enough time to explain such variety.

Yet doubts persisted during the next two centuries, voiced by scholars who felt emboldened by the swell of Protestant and Enlightenment sentiment. They pointed out, among other things, that the chronology of scriptural genealogies provides an insufficient time span to account for the conspicuous ethnic differences encountered in the new worlds. In the mid-seventeenth century, the theologian Isaac La Peyrère advanced sacrilegious speculations about separate pre-Adamite creations. His book *Prae-Adamitae*, which first appeared in 1655, cleverly challenged church dogma through literalist readings of the book of Genesis (one of which is that if Cain could take a wife, she must have belonged to a non-Adamite tribe). Peyrère's standing in the eyes of the Catholic Church was only made worse by his insistence on one particularly impertinent conclusion: since Gentiles were created

before Adam and the Law, only Jews are the real descendants of Adam and Eve.

A century later, the Scotsman Henry Home, judge, jurist, historian, and an altogether influential figure with a stunning proclivity to commit logical fallacies, theorized the separate creation of multiple human progenitors and sketched the diverse histories of their descendants. Despite his strict adherence to polygenism, Home also asserted that racial differentiation is God's punishment for humans' impudence as epitomized by the Tower of Babel—a blow, one has to assume, dealt to members of the same species. Despite these and other theoretical incongruities, Home exhibits on every page of his writings the unwavering will to prove monogenism wrong at all costs. The first book of his four-volume *Sketches of the History of Man*²⁴ is riddled with rancor against continental scientists (Frenchmen and Germans especially), a succession of non sequiturs, and bold appeals to the common sense of dog breeders. He ridicules Buffon's fertility-criterion for the determination of species-membership as "artificial," objecting that if different canine pure breeds (which he seems to consider species) produce fertile crossbreeds, this happens only from dogs' "want of choice, or from depraved appetite." He accuses Buffon of having pilfered Linnaeus's work, only to add that the latter's fame is entirely undeserved because of his having "wandered wonderfully far from nature in classing animals." Unimpressed by categorial distinctions among class, order, species, variety, and race, Home vents his exasperation over Linnaeus's joining of men and bats in the same mammalian category, and ends his criticism with the mocking rhetorical question: "What will a plain man think of a method of classing that denies a whale to be a fish?"

Of greater interest, in view of the ethical and political implications of monogenist and polygenist beliefs, is Home's complete confidence that the physical environment has no impact whatsoever on racial diversifications, given that the latter issue exclusively from divine creation or divine punishment—as the case may be. Yet even here Home finds exceptions, albeit ones that run counter to the scientific consensus among monogenists. First, he allows for the physical environment to be determinative, but only insofar as different races were created to fit different environments. Second, and as a consequence of this made-to-fit creationism, a race of human beings can be impacted *negatively* by moving to an environment that is not theirs. Hence Home informs his readers that "Europeans who are born in Batavia²⁵ soon degenerate" and that the "Portuguese who settled . . . the Congo, retain scarce the appearance of men." In one more logical twist, however, he proves the imperviousness of the Jewish "species" because of the peculiar resistance it exercises against new environs: "In the suburbs of Cochin, a town in Malabar, there is a colony of industrious Jews of the same complexion they have in Europe."²⁶

The belligerent first volume of Home's masterpiece is meant to provide a naturalistic foundation for the ethical-political theory developed in

the remaining volumes, a theory intended perhaps as a challenge to Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* and *The Wealth of Nations*. Both of Home's views—the deteriorating effect of new environments and the naturalistic foundation of ethics and politics—would play a very important role in late nineteenth-century British anthropology (discussed below). Home's brand of naturalism deserves one last quotation: "There is no propensity in human nature more general than aversion to strangers. And yet some nations must be excepted, not indeed many in number, who are remarkably kind to strangers; by which circumstance they appear to be of a peculiar race."

Several eighteenth-century thinkers—many of them with more sophisticated arguments than Home's—rejoiced in their emancipation from ecumenical creed, and so polygenism became a scientific doctrine.

In all, emancipatory tendencies predominated in monogenist circles, while conservatism and downright proslavery views prevailed among polygenists. Yet there is no reason to indulge facile associations of monogenism with what we may call egalitarianism, or of polygenism with the kind of racial ranking sometimes referred to today with the term "supremacism." The historical allegiances of monogenists and polygenists with ideologies of either universal emancipation or racial domination have been rather tangled and multifaceted. During the Middle Ages and early modernity, polygenism was often rejected, not because of superior scientific evidence or because of a preferable moral principle, but simply and dogmatically because it undermined the book of Genesis. In colonial and postcolonial North America, many slaveholding states actually refused to adopt polygenism as an official doctrine despite its wide support in popular and academic antiabolitionist circles. Some polygenists even explicitly rejected slavery because that familial institution encouraged "miscegenation," allegedly an infringement of the natural or divinely instituted separation of the races. Monogenism, in its turn, was not always a spring of emancipatory convictions. First, as noted, it agreed nicely with Holy Scripture, a feature that secularly inclined thinkers of the age did not consider (in hindsight, incorrectly) conducive to the cause of universal human freedom. Second, monogenism left room for hypotheses of racial devolutions from a superior original stock: the resulting hierarchy of human types could then easily be made to accommodate the exploitation, subjection, or enslavement of various savage groups, a view usually accompanied by philanthropic and educational justifications like those we have found in Hegel's Africa lecture, where a principled rejection of slavery nonetheless allows for its transient emancipatory function. Finally, to magnify the political complexity of these influential theories of origins, in the southern states of the American nation it was monogenism and not polygenism that lent a humanistic veneer to arguments for secession. By appealing to social paternalism, these arguments were meant to soften the straightforwardly economic rationale for the continuation of the "peculiar institution." The short version of this kind of monogenism-based argument, in the words of

a contemporary historian, was that the abolition of slavery would represent “the destruction of a paternalist society, where the whites were no longer able to protect their ‘black families.’”²⁷

3. From Enlightenment to Reaction: Johann Blumenbach to James Hunt

One major author for whom scientific monogenism and radical ethical universalism went hand in hand was Hegel’s contemporary, the scientist and social egalitarian Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840). In his vastly influential works,²⁸ Blumenbach offers the first modern racial classification in a monogenist framework based on two sets of arguments: scientific and ethical. Blumenbach’s anthropology is Rousseauian and occasionally naive, as when without comment he invokes the “natural domesticity” of man. But his scientific grounding, vast scholarship, and ethical commitment to Enlightenment universalism make him stand out among his contemporaries. Races, Blumenbach teaches in his *Beyträge zur Naturgeschichte* (1790; *Contributions on Natural History*), are varieties (*Menschenvarietäten*) of one and the same human stem (*das Menschengeschlecht*)—no matter what feelings this scientific perspective may arouse in certain European circles:

There have been persons who have most earnestly protested against their noble selves being placed in the natural system in one common species . . . with Negroes and Hottentots.²⁹ And again, there have been others who have had no compunction in declaring themselves and the orangutan to be creatures of one and the same species.³⁰ . . . Perhaps . . . it will contribute . . . to the tranquillization of many upon this familiar affair, if I name three philosophers of otherwise quite different opinions . . . [namely] Haller, Linnaeus, and Buffon. All three considered man different by a whole world from the orangutan, and . . . all true men, Europeans, Negroes, etc., as mere varieties [*Spielarten*] of one and the same original species [*Stammgattung*]. (Blumenbach 1790, 56–58)

Blumenbach’s general proof of monogenism (though not, unfortunately, his pugnacious antiracism) is the kind of “external touchstone” that Hegel considers necessary for the corroboration of theoretical truths—here, the truth of Hegel’s own universalistic concept of being-human. Blumenbach’s proof consists of two generalizations from empirical studies and one methodological principle.

The first generalization from empirical findings is that the physical peculiarities of the human species that are absent from all other species are found to be common to all human races. The second generalization is that different

traits among races and ethnic subgroups are without exception gradations of common features; none indicates an evolutionary leap. As for the methodological criterion, the “science of man” requires that secondary evidence from travelers’ reports and artists’ sketches be eclipsed by direct acquaintance with “the open book of nature” (Blumenbach 1790, 70). Only in this way can scholarship avoid falling prey to shameful distortions of phenotypes, customs, and behaviors perpetrated by traveling portraitists and self-styled experts: “There are not many authors of travels whose pictures, so far as regards the likenesses of nations, can be trusted,” Blumenbach warns in *De Generis* (1775, xxxvii–xxxviii). The following excerpt from chapter 13 of the *Beyträge* perfectly encapsulates his relentless denunciation of contemporaneous fabrications, caricatures, and perversions:

As to the physiognomy of the Negroes, the distance no doubt is striking if one contrasts an ugly Negro (of whom there are of course as many as ugly Europeans) with a Greek ideal. But . . . if . . . one follows the transitional forms . . . , the conspicuous contrast . . . disappears altogether—and obviously there must exist extremes in this case as in all other creatures that branch out [*ausarten*] into several varieties. (Blumenbach 1790, 88)

The English renditions of the verb *ausarten* will be discussed shortly. It is sufficient to note here the misleading translation of the last phrase by Bendyshe: “there must be extremes here as well as in the case of other creatures which *degenerate* into all sorts of races and varieties” (Blumenbach [1865] 1969, trans. Bendyshe, 306; emphasis added).

Beyond the criterion of direct acquaintance with what he calls the open book of nature, Blumenbach could have added another standard for his own research: familiarity with the open book of society. Chapter 13 of the *Beyträge* is dedicated entirely to the accomplishments of famous African individuals in European and American society, as well as to the character and demeanor of personal acquaintances from Africa. The latter include a lady met at Yverdun, “whose parents were both from the Congo” and whose “most pleasing” appearance and physiognomy made her in no way different, “if abstraction be made of the color,” from “our European ladies” (Blumenbach 1790, 89–90). In the Bendyshe translation, Blumenbach’s “if abstraction be made of the color” becomes “if one could . . . set aside the disagreeable skin” (Blumenbach [1865] 1969, trans. Bendyshe, 307).³¹

Blumenbach waxes lyrical about the few reliable accounts by unprejudiced travelers to Africa and the Middle East, all of whom testify to the moral capacity of “our black brethren, as well as their *natural* kindheartedness, qualities in which they are hardly inferior to any other variety of the human species.” He is particularly keen to extol the abilities, the “free and agreeable decorum,” and finally—quoting the naturalist Adanson—*la beauté parfaite*

of African women. In a nearly declamatory tone, Blumenbach reminds his audience of the demonstrated moral fiber of the African race, “which has never been numbed or smothered on the transport ships and the West Indian sugar plantations by the bestial brutality [*viehische Brutalität*] of their white executioners” (Blumenbach 1790, 90–91).

Blumenbach’s fervor is, however, not limited to invoking Romantic or paternalistic views of the natural innocence of the life of savages in striking contrast to the corruption and depravity of European civil society. He is particularly affronted by the attribution of “obtuse mental capacities” (Blumenbach 1790, 84) to Africans—just the kind of attribution we find reflected in Hegel’s oral commentaries on the African soul. Besides collecting craniums, Blumenbach was a zealous collector of the artistic, scientific, and literary works of Africans. In chapter 13 of the *Beyträge* he sings the praises of Abba Gregorius, an Ethiopian scholar and author of grammars, dictionaries, and encyclopedias in Latin and two African languages, who visited Gotha in 1652; and of celebrated African contemporaries like “young Freidig, master musician in Vienna”;³² Angelo Soliman, a Nigerian erudite and royal tutor to the prince of Lichtenstein; Abram Petrovich Gannibal, a mathematician, engineer, and artillery colonel in the Russian army (and, unbeknownst to Blumenbach, great-grandfather of Alexander Pushkin); Geoffroy Lislet, a correspondent of the Paris Academy of the Sciences; the Maryland savant Thomas Fuller, who was legendary for his prodigious computational abilities; and black doctors, theologians, and poets writing in English, Dutch, and Latin. Blumenbach quotes directly from the already mentioned slave trader John Barbot, according to whom illiterate Africans possess “an almost unfathomably strong memory” and demonstrate “as much acumen and craft as any European merchant,” no doubt on account of “their having been so often deceived by the Europeans” (quoted in Blumenbach 1790, 93–94). With an irony not lost on European readers, Blumenbach reminds those who belittle the cultural achievements of African peoples how easy it would be “to mention considerable provinces of Europe, from out of which one would hardly expect such good writers, poets, philosophers, and correspondents of the Paris Academy” (Blumenbach 1790, 118). The chapter concludes with an emphatic statement that fully betrays the author’s exasperation at dishonest scholarship about the African race: “I don’t know . . . of any other so-called *savage* nation under the sun that has so much distinguished itself by such examples of perfectibility and even capacity for scientific culture . . . as the *Negro*” (Blumenbach 1790, 118). It remains a deplorable fact of contemporary scholarship that this and similar statements from Blumenbach’s original works are never acknowledged by commentators who are determined to prove (for reasons not easy to identify) the inherent racism of his anthropological theory.

Blumenbach counters polygenist doctrines as much through the force of empirical evidence (not least his famous skull collection) as through logical deduction: if polygenism was correct, differences among the races would

not be a matter of fluid anatomical transitions. Yet any competent comparative anatomist can testify that the races, just like individuals, differ only by degrees.

Blumenbach's monogenism is developmental but lacks Darwin's conceptions of mutation and selection, as well as a clear notion of genetic inheritance. Therefore, Blumenbach is a Lamarckian: traits acquired in new environs become inheritable over the course of a few generations. Hegel takes several pieces of wisdom directly from Blumenbach (and other Lamarckians like Peter Camper)³³ when he states, among other things: "It is apparent that blackness is due to the climate. The descendants of the Portuguese [in Africa] are . . . black like the native Negroes." Yet Hegel, perhaps mindful of Kant's rejection of the climatic hypothesis,³⁴ is also on record as boldly including a hereditary explanation for Europeans' darkening in African lands: in the 1825 lectures (Griesheim/Kehler MS) he is recorded as adding that such darkening may well happen "also through mixing" (Hegel 1978, 3:47).

Blumenbach's developmental monogenism is based on a typology of five races that he derives from comparative craniology. The variations closest to the Caucasian race are the Carib and the Malay; these in turn connect the Caucasian to the two races furthest from it, respectively the African and the Mongolian. Once more, one of Blumenbach's passages regarding the perception of aesthetic differences among the races is often cited, by contemporary proponents of his racist turn of mind, in a highly misleading and mutilated form: "Europeans . . . are . . . the most handsome of men." But the original passage differs starkly: "The *Europeans* and *Western Asians* . . . together with the *North Africans* . . . are according to European concepts of beauty [*nach den europäischen Begriffen von Schönheit*] the best formed human beings" (Blumenbach 1790, 82).

Like Linnaeus and Hegel, Blumenbach understands racial differences as neither stable nor created, but rather fluid inner-species variations resulting from geographic segregation, historic migrations, and, last but not least, sexual intercourse: "The natural scientist has still to be born who, on truthful grounds, would dare to establish a determinate boundary between [the varieties of mankind]" (Blumenbach 1790, 60).

Since Blumenbach's original writings are easily available, contemporary misrepresentations of his work are more perplexing than ever. As shown by the life sciences historian Thomas Juncker in 1998, for example, Stephen Jay Gould illustrated his claim that Blumenbach's scientific work "has promoted conventional racism ever since" (Gould 1996, 412) by rearranging Blumenbach's horizontal representation of craniums in pyramidal form.³⁵

Despite the scientific detail and logical rigor on which Blumenbach grounds his humanistic universalism, his race typology would eventually become an opportunity for others—especially in the second half of the nineteenth century—to rank races according to evaluative criteria that go well beyond those of cranial aesthetics "according to European concepts." A major tool in the

arsenal of misrepresentations of Blumenbachian anthropology that developed at the turn of the nineteenth century was the increasingly pejorative use of the Latin term *degeneratio* (simply translated in English as “degeneration”), of its German derivative *Degeneration*, and of the older Germanic terms *Ausartung* and *Abartung*. Well into the time of Blumenbach, Kant, and Hegel, these Latin and Germanic terms appear in scientific contexts in the value-neutral senses of “branching out,” “engenderment,” “derivation,” “development,” and even “conversion.” In *De Generis Humani Varietate Nativa* (1775; *On the Natural Variety of Mankind*), for example, Blumenbach inquires about the causes and ways in which, as a whole, “animalium species degenerant” and “humanum genus degeneravit,” that is, ways in which animal species and the human genus have branched out into or engendered varieties. In the *Beyträge*, he invites the reader to appreciate how the “derivation [*Degeneration*] of animals and plants from their original stock [*Stammmrace*] belongs to the striking demonstrations of the variability of creation” (Blumenbach 1790, 33). In the Latin text of *De Generis*, he discusses the proto-Darwinian question of how a primal species might be said to have engendered varieties under the heading: “Quomodo species primitiva in varietates degenerat?” (Blumenbach 1775, sections 2 and 3). In the *Beyträge*, he sets out to study “Die Ausartung der organisirten Körper,” that is, “The Differentiation of Organic Bodies,” as well as the “Ausartung des vollkommensten aller Hausthiere—des Menschen,” that is, “The Differentiation of the Most Perfect of All Domestic Animals—Man” (the titles of chapters 6 and 8). If *Ausartung* is rendered in English as “degeneration” in its pejorative meaning, as done by Bendyshe, Blumenbach’s chapter titles become utterly bewildering. Bendyshe’s translation of “Ausartung der organisirten Körper” as “Degeneration of Organized Bodies” is at best ambiguous, but his rendering of “Ausartung des vollkommensten aller Hausthiere—des Menschen” as “Degeneration of Man, the Most Perfect of All Domestic Animals” (Blumenbach [1865] 1969, trans. Bendyshe, 293) is positively nonsensical.

In German scientific literature, the use of *Ausartung* is attested for the first time in the middle of the seventeenth century, where it indicates differentiation, including the loss of features (inborn or acquired, useful or harmful ones) and the derivation from, conversion into, or alteration into different forms.³⁶ In the 1763 essay on the concept of “negative magnitudes,” Kant writes that “the attractive force . . . close to the bodies by and by *ausartet* into a repulsive one” (Kant [1763] 1969d, 169). In the essay on the sublime and the beautiful we read that all initial feelings in marriage eventually “*ausarten* in loving intimacy” (Kant [1764] 1969a, 242). And in 1775 (“Of the Different Races of Human Beings”) Kant recommends terminological distinctions for use in biological contexts. According to his recommendations, *Ausartung* should be used for infertile cases of *Abartung* (derivation from a common stock)—a reproductive cul-de-sac. This is indeed a *biologically* negative connotation of *Ausartung*, one, however, that clearly does not apply

to the human races. In this essay Kant writes, with reference to the whole of the animal kingdom:

An animal genus [*Tiergattung*] . . . originating from a common phylum [*Stamm*] does not contain . . . different species [*Arten*] (since these signify precisely differences in phyletic origin); rather their mutual divergencies are called varieties [*Abartungen*], when hereditary. The hereditary marks of phyletic descent, when compatible with their origin, are called varietal forms [*Nachartungen*]; but should the variety no longer be capable of generating the original phyletic form, it would be called degeneration [*Ausartung*]. (Kant 1969f, 430)

With regard to the human races, Blumenbach and like-minded scholars do not follow Kant's recommendations. They continue to use *Ausartung* in the sense of "variety," including when they are referring to the human races. After all, fertility between the races was in the eighteenth century the most robust, widely known, frowned upon, and often reviled proof of monogenism.

A pejorative use of *Ausartung* began to take root during this same period in political and social contexts. "The nobility," one political economist writes in 1760, is what keeps "the unchecked monarchy from *Ausartung* into despotism" (von Justi 1760, 117). In 1781, a historian of Judaism explains that "the unnatural oppression under which Jews have lived for so many centuries has certainly contributed as much to their general ethical corruptness as to the *Ausartung* of their religious laws from their original goodness and usefulness" (von Dohm 1781, 143).

There is little doubt that the 1865 publication of Bendyshe's paraphrasing translation of Blumenbach's works, including his rendering of the German terms *Degeneration* and *Ausartung* and the Latin term *degeneratio* as "degeneration" instead of the available alternatives, contributed and is still contributing much to misreadings of Blumenbach's work.

The introduction of the pejorative connotations of *Degeneration* and *Ausartung* from sociopolitical into naturalistic (particularly racial) subject matter would eventually, in the twentieth century, restrict these words' meaning to that of the production of weaker or perverted results. But projecting these new significations indiscriminately back onto earlier uses of the words means ignoring etymological and historical fact, as well as scientific and theoretical usage. One might as well, then, construe Darwin's "descent" of man to indicate a downward movement from higher and more sophisticated life forms to lower and poorer ones.



After Blumenbach, the last major natural philosopher to think of human variation in the categories of an uncompromising universalism is Jean-Baptist

Lamarck. The French scientist centered his *Philosophie biologique* (1809) on a general theory of natural change. Nature's transformationism can only be understood as a function of the inheritability of acquired properties. *La marche de la nature*, as he calls his version of universal development, can be described as a continuous branching out of limbs from the sturdy trunk of the phylogenetic tree. For Lamarck, neither races nor varieties are fixed. Rather, the whole of organic nature, including differentiations within the human species, is characterized by the fluidity of its transitions. With Lamarck's younger contemporary, Georges Cuvier, who discovered prehistoric mass extinctions, natural types acquired a new fixity. Yet even Cuvier rejected polygenist explanations of the human races. Still, contrary to Blumenbach, he did find the European type to represent anthropological excellence, and explained measurable cranial differences among human groups by recourse to their (hypothetical) geographical separation in primordial times.

With the onset of counter-Enlightenment sentiment, the European and American "science of man" shifted increasingly toward racial thinking. This is the generic view that physical, mental, behavioral, and, as a consequence, cultural and social disparities are primarily determined by membership in a natural group—a biological caste, as it were—thus making the disparities, if not essential, *quasi-immutable*, and their differential treatment justifiable. Of course, the nineteenth-century history of anthropology as an academic specialization includes vastly different theoretical frameworks for the interpretation of human and racial characteristics and behavior. These range from the convinced monogenism of Lewis Henry Morgan ("The history of the human race is one in source, one in experience, one in progress"; Morgan 1877, Preface), whose work formed the anthropological foundation of Friedrich Engels's study of the process of civilization,³⁷ to the polygenism of Samuel G. Morton, who explained intelligence (or preferably the lack thereof) by the inner volume of skulls. Morton's *Crania Americana* (1839) helped make polygenism an acceptable scientific hypothesis in American anthropology. Among his colleagues were the former monogenist and later racist theoretician Louis Agassiz, as well as Josiah Nott and Henry Hotze, who, being staunch defenders of the fixity and separation of the races, became the English translators of Arthur de Gobineau's vehement *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines* (1853).

The arc of Morton's career is eerily emblematic of the radical reversal from eighteenth-century scientific universalism to nineteenth-century particularism and racism. Morton began his own skull collection in preparation for an 1830 lecture dedicated to Blumenbach's five-races theory. After his death (1851) in antebellum South Carolina, Morton was eulogized in the *Charleston Medical Journal* with an epitaph that would have made Blumenbach turn in his grave: "We can only say that we of the South should consider him as our benefactor, for aiding most materially in giving the negro his true position as an inferior race."³⁸

The views of the remaining antagonists of racist theories in the second half of the nineteenth century are best embodied by Karl Marx's ironic riposte to political economists' treatment of the "Negro slave problem":

What is a negro slave? A man of the black race . . . A Negro is a Negro. Only under certain conditions does he become a slave. A cotton-spinning machine is a machine for spinning cotton. Only under certain conditions does it become *capital*. (Marx 1961; Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 6:407)

Like other late heirs of the Enlightenment, Marx took it for granted that social categories such as slave status or being a source of profit do not issue from the natural categories to which they become historically attached. He also still operated under Hegelian assumptions of the need to distinguish between essence (for example, species-essence or *Gattungswesen*) and phenotype, or between the concept of an entity and its phenomenal existence. Even less philosophically inclined thinkers than Marx, some of them polygenists, shared the view that human differences in spiritual capacities are not traceable to racial lines of descent. Some earlier polygenists had actually anticipated, though with a decidedly paternalistic bent, Hegel's already quoted stance that "from origins one can never derive any ground for humans' right or lack of right to freedom and power." At the end of the eighteenth century, for example, the committed polygenist Charles White opposed slavery on account of the fact that "laws ought not to allow greater freedom to a Shakespeare or Milton, a Locke or a Newton, than to men of inferior capacities," among whom he counted "thousands of Europeans" as well as an unspecified number of "negroes" and no doubt women of any color (White 1799, 138). By the second half of the nineteenth century, however, even such even-handed paternalism had been left behind. The early history of the Anthropological Society of London, which commissioned Bendyshe's translation of Blumenbach's works, is most instructive in this regard.

The society was founded in 1863 by polygenists in open rebellion against its predecessor, the Ethnological Society of London, whose scientific consensus had been monogenist and Darwinian. The leader of the newly minted Anthropological Society, James Hunt, reads like a somewhat more polished version of Henry Home. Among Hunt's central claims are the following: Negroes are a separate species from Europeans; Darwinism is unscientific *because* it presupposes the unity of mankind; adaptation is a myth, while "exhaustion and degeneracy" (Hunt 1863, 60)³⁹ are the logical consequences of resettlement; and anthropology needs no theory but only facts and "the logical inferences from such data" (Hunt 1863). Crucially, according to Hunt, anthropology must form the basis for the science of political economy. In the Anniversary Address he gave to the society in 1867, he wrote:

The science of political economy must be based simply and solely on the facts discovered by the anthropologist . . . We are the students and interpreters of nature's laws, and it is our duty . . . not . . . to raise up in the name of "social science" a code of morals based upon an assumption of human equality and consequently equal human rights, because we know that human equality is a mere dream and all systems based on it are mere chimeras. (Hunt 1867; quoted in Rainger 1978, 55)

Not surprisingly, Hunt thought highly of transatlantic social arrangements then at risk of extinction—the American Civil War having ended two years before this Address. He thought so highly of slavery, in fact, that he was willing to indulge, against his own principles, adaptationist beliefs as long as those helped corroborate other "data" accounted for by polygenist views: "Scientific men . . . dare not close their eyes to the clear facts, as to the improvement in mind and body, as well as the general happiness, which is seen in those parts of the world, in which the Negro is working in his natural subordination to the European" (Hunt 1864, lv–lvi; quoted in Rainger 1978, 62). Nor does Hunt lack the distinctive sarcasm of so many later racist thinkers: "In some respects . . . the Negro is far superior to the European . . . Occupations and diseases which are fatal to the Europeans, are quite harmless to the Negro. By their juxtaposition in this part of the world, they confer a material benefit on each other" (Hunt 1864, lvi). Few descriptions of the "peculiar institution" deserve so fully, *mutatis mutandis*, the nearly contemporaneous Marxian parody of the free labor market as the purported Eden of the rights of man in the first volume of *Kapital*: "There alone rule Freedom, Equality, Property and Bentham . . . [Thus] do they all, in accordance with the pre-established harmony of things, or under the auspices of an all-shrewd providence, work together to their mutual advantage, for the common weal and in the interest of all" (Marx 1867; Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 23:189).

When cultural anthropology and sociology adopted models of competition and of the "survival of the fittest" hijacked from Darwin's theory of evolution, these models lent themselves to reactionary worldviews more readily than did Lamarckian models of gradual adaptation to the environment. Even to this general rule, however, there were prominent exceptions. Writing in the second half of Hegel's century, Ernst Haeckel⁴⁰ best illustrates the tortuous relations between competing scientific theories and ideological agendas. While Haeckel did more than most to promote Darwin's *Origin of Species*, at the same time he rejected Darwin's monogenism and some of the fundamental evolutionary tenets connected with it. Relying heavily on August Schleicher's⁴¹ theory of the multiple origins of languages, which fit "scientific" polygenism like a glove, Haeckel proposed an alternative to monogenism, namely, an evolutionary polygenism that combined Lamarck's adaptational theory with Schleicher's linguistics. Haeckel's theory of multiple

human “species” (sometimes called “stems” and sometimes “races”) was centered on the tenet that language produces consciousness and not the other way around. Since there exist multiple language stems that are unrelated—an assumption for which Schleicher had allegedly provided proof—it follows that there must be multiple human stems that are equally unrelated to one another. With these arguments, Haeckel at once pioneered twentieth-century doctrines of the linguistic origin of consciousness, and race-centered theories of the human species.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the academic controversy surrounding mankind, races, and human typologies was still ostensibly one about the polygenic or monogenic origins of modern humans. In their effort to counter sacrilegious polygenism, Bible monogenists found themselves in painful proximity to Darwin’s followers. The embarrassment was of course mutual: biblical creationism was (and is) the farthest from the scientific turn of mind of the scholars of evolution. To complicate the picture, some polygenists accommodated Darwinism by allowing for a common descent of many types from one species, while simply expanding the range—and importance—of race-forming factors. This was achieved by replacing or integrating mutation and selection with a new determinant called “orthogenesis,” the complex (and metaphysically fraught) idea of separate evolutions caused by different factors that are endogenous to each type.⁴²

In the same historical period, the need to justify the economic-political realities of industrialization, including the destruction of premodern ways of life, forced mass migrations, and capital’s need for the exploitation of ever-new human resources, posed increased difficulties for scientists and philosophers to embrace an anthropological universalism of Blumenbach’s type. The spread of anti-illuminationism and antiuniversalism in twentieth-century philosophic thought made it arduous, or just unpopular, to appeal even to ambivalent and evasive solutions of Hegel’s type, namely: let us cut the Gordian knot of the separate or common origins of mankind by proving that, no matter which scientific approach will eventually prevail, no path leads from either kind of origin to the theoretical and ethical recognition of the human individual as an end in itself, a creature of right.

Before going back to Hegel’s text, it is worthwhile observing that the monogenism versus polygenism quarrel still informs today’s physical anthropology, though of course in modified form. A major debate pits the “multiregionalism” of the paleoanthropologists against the “matrilinearism” of molecular geneticists. Both sides recognize one species, *Homo sapiens*, as the common origin of all current human groups, which include races as much as ethnicities or Hegelian *Lokalgeister*. But multiregionalists identify the last primate speciation as the separation of *Homo sapiens* from *Homo erectus* a few million years ago, from which time on racial diversifications would have taken place through separate evolutionary mechanisms confined to regional patterns. The matrilinearists’ views instead (popularized by Stephen

Jay Gould as the “Eve theory”) stress a much more recent date for the emergence of the species *Homo sapiens*, thus making the properly evolutionary change of the human species precede all racial variations. The so-called Eve theory is predicated upon the idea that the genetic material of mitochondrial DNA, which is inherited only matrilinearly, can never have been affected by selection mechanisms, while of course being subject to (rare) mutations. Therefore, the argument goes, all present-day mitochondrial genetic variations must have split from one common and relatively recent maternal source (which Goethe would have been keen to identify with the *Urmutter* from his *Faust*).⁴³ Despite sharing the principle that races are variations internal to the same species, the two sides in this contemporary debate at times assume hostile undertones because of their respective conceptual kinship with polygenism and monogenism.

Could Hegel have been aware of the persistence of early modern debates about human origins well into the twenty-first century, he would have objected that the contenders ignore that personhood is a product of self-reflective thought—as implied perhaps in the (grammatically dubious) scientific designation *Homo sapiens sapiens*. This means that the rational animal is capable of relating to itself not just as an animal species—in itself a remarkable feat of reflection—but as one whose essence (the *Gattungswesen*) is universality: a *genus* of persons. The next sections of the *Anthropology* address precisely this *genus* of persons.

Chapter 5



No Longer Just Animal Life

1. The Soul of Peoples

The five fundamental races identified by eighteenth-century physical anthropology represent for Hegel the broadest self-differentiations of the natural soul of the human kind. Yet in mankind the animal soul dirempts itself further, acquiring features conspicuously absent from those of other kinds. From its inception, the natural history of humanity is inextricably bound up with this species' self-cultivation. In mankind, the history of nature, *Historie*, runs seamlessly into a history of spirit, *Geschichte*. The latter is for Hegel by definition *Geistesgeschichte*.

In view of the twofold meaning of "history" as both a discipline and its subject matter, it may be helpful to briefly clarify the word's German uses and thus Hegel's. Up until the nineteenth century, the German *Historie* was the preferred term for "natural history," and was mostly used for taxonomical undertakings after the model of Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis historia*. *Historie* denoted the study and the subject matter of the circular movement of what, despite being in perennial motion, never truly changes: life-and-death cycles as much as planetary revolutions. By contrast, *Geschichte* was mostly used to refer to the political history of mankind. The word is a nominalization of the verb *Geschehen*, "to happen."¹ It therefore indicates an open-ended process and often implies a novelty character like that retained in *Ereignis* (event).²

Due to the peculiar neediness of the species that, to speak with the Young Hegelians, must continuously produce its means of subsistence and its life forms, rather than finding them, through some instinctual makeup, ready-made in the immediate environment,³ humanity's natural and cultural developments blend with one another. According to Hegel, this fusion is most starkly in evidence in the differences among subgroups of a common ethnicity, that is, the small- or large-scale "local spirits" (*Lokalgeister*) often identified as peoples or nations (*Völker*).⁴ A "national character" in Hegel's usage is the result of a shared way of life. This includes the collective behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs resulting from a common linguistic or religious foundation that is independent of the geographic and political boundaries of

nation-states—though these boundaries may periodically coincide with the language, religion, or customs of one people. The history of a people may therefore include developments in general physical traits, but is principally the history of a common intellectual and moral outlook.

The extensive commentaries on national character transcribed as the Addition to §394 focus almost exclusively on European regional cultures. Hegel's talk of Italian "sensibility," French "understanding," the English propensity for "intellectual intuition," or the Germans' "bent for rumination" wanders well off the path of a natural history of the soul. One may attribute these lighthearted cogitations to a need for a jocular interlude on Hegel's part. It is equally possible that underlying these jovial (and often still pertinent) characterizations is Hegel's conception of the political history of modern Europe as the most recent stage in world spirit's history—a topic that does not really belong under the heading of "subjective spirit" but rather under that of "objective spirit." The very fact that he is reported to have discussed national characters in such an odd place in his system may indicate that Hegel the chronicler of *Lokalgeist* aims at providing Hegel the philosopher of *Weltgeist* with the broad strokes of a cultural-anthropological underpinning of the irrefutable fact of European world hegemony. Whatever the interpretation, Hegel's views on the peoples of Europe merit our brief attention as illustrations of his concept of (large-scale) "local spirits."

The relative stability of national characters is, like the relative stability of the races, at first linked to the constancy of their environs. A desert, an ocean, a landlocked sea, a boundless steppe, horizons blocked by a mountain range, and the climate itself are bound to shape through the generations the activities and dispositions of any human group. So do, however, the obligations and prohibitions that peoples have imposed upon themselves since time immemorial—their totems and taboos. These determinants are actually stronger than those imposed by nature. For example, while life adjacent to the Mediterranean basin has been for its peoples an incentive to discovery and travel, life near the Indian Ocean has not given such fruits: "Since the earliest time, [Indians] have slavishly obeyed the established prohibition to navigate the open sea" (*Enc* §394 Zus). The reference is to proscriptions like those from the *Laws of Manu* (200 B.C.), warning Hindus of the danger of impurity implicit in a number of activities, among which are journeys by sea.⁵ In a somewhat hasty inference, Hegel connects this legal prohibition, linked as it is to fear of contamination, to the endurance of the caste system in India, a condition that he considers by contrast "intolerable to nations spontaneously given to navigating the seas" (*Enc* §394 Zus).

Untroubled by the possibility that the greater variations he perceives among European peoples may be a function of his greater familiarity with them, Hegel claims that the strongest national dissimilarities are found in Europe. He first makes a brief mention of other "local spirits" that belong to cultures of world-historical significance, namely the Oriental, Greek, Roman,

and Germanic worlds known to his audience from the pertinent *Lectures on the Philosophy of History* and from the closing sections of the 1820 *Philosophy of Right*. Ancient testimonies abound about shared perceptions of a bewildering palette of regional characters among the Greek, Roman, and Germanic peoples. In Greece, for example, the “ethical substance” (*Enc* §394 *Zus*) of the Spartan, Theban, and Athenian peoples is said to center on different principles. While the Spartan ethos is characterized by unreflective conformity with the social whole as it is given, the Theban ethos puts inwardness and bonds of friendship ahead of social objectivity in a way rather unusual for the rest of the Hellenic world. As one would expect, Hegel credits the Athenian ethos with representing the unity of these opposites. The Athenian citizen recognizes social objectivity, but through subjective and public reflection: “The rights of the state and of the individual have found in the Athenians a unification as complete as was possible from the Greek standpoint” (*Enc* §394 *Zus*)—that is, as complete as possible in an ancient slave society. The tenor of Hegel’s forays into the cultural history of ancient Greek *ethnoi* with their differing moral outlooks and common humanity is strongly reminiscent of Herodotus’s *Histories*. Missing from Hegel’s presentation, however, is Herodotus’s self-conscious disclaimer: “I need not apologize for the digression—it has been my plan throughout this book to put down odd bits of information not directly connected with my main subject” (Herodotus 1954, bk. 4, 251).⁶ After this brief survey of the Greeks, Hegel’s commentary swiftly turns to the national idiosyncrasies of modern Europeans.

To this day, Italians betray the “feminine trait” of relying on sentiment and ignoring general principles—a feature that extends to their fragmented and scattered political life, in which the common good is always subordinated to “the spirit of partisanship” (*Enc* §394 *Zus*). In truly Machiavellian style, the leaders of the Italian people are conspicuous for pretending to aim at the common good while pursuing their own good alone, and this “occasionally in a highly tyrannical, ferocious manner” (*Enc* §394 *Zus*).

Spanish culture fares better in Hegel’s taxonomy. Though the Spaniards are as individualistic as the Italians, they are on the whole more inclined to reflection. This means that they are able to subsume their particular interests under universal principles—thus the importance of honor in their lives. Yet holding fast to principle is a double-edged sword. Because the Italian people are unprincipled, they are also unlikely to fall prey to fanaticism: “The Italian does not let himself be unduly disturbed by religious scruples in his cheerful enjoyment of life.”⁷ By contrast, the Spaniard, Hegel notes, “has so far held onto the letter of Catholic doctrine” (*Enc* §394 *Zus*), a cultural trait for which he credits the Inquisition’s vehement persecutions of heretics and infidels—a persecutory zeal which Hegel, however, does not attribute, as we would expect, to European vigor or Spanish fanaticism, but to none other than “African inhumanity” (*Enc* §394 *Zus*). Setting aside this flabbergasting imputation of Spanish persecutory zeal to “African” (presumably Moorish)

dispositions, in the light of recent historical research this Addition's somewhat emphatic distinction between the Spanish and Italian "national spirits" is perhaps less idiosyncratic than at first appears. Newer research⁸ undermines the customary identification of the policies and practices of the Spanish Inquisition with the will of the Roman Holy See (whose leaders, incidentally, were almost without exception of Italian extraction), and stresses instead the little-known history of conflict between the Italian papacy and the Spanish monarchy during the heyday of the Inquisition. Against King Ferdinand's attempt to extend the Inquisition to Aragon, for example, Pope Sixtus IV promulgated in 1482 a bull condemning events in Spain in which "because of the testimony of enemies and . . . without proofs of any kind [Christians] have been locked up . . . , tortured and condemned . . . at great danger to their souls, giving a pernicious example and causing scandal to many" (quoted in Kamen 1997, 49).

As for the French *Lokalgeist*, Hegel thinks of it as a felicitous union of Italian spiritual agility (or fickleness) and Spanish steadfastness (or zeal). The proverbial frivolity of the French originates in their desire to please—the essence of *esprit*. Despite its being a mark of the refinement of manners, French *esprit* can be carried too far. "In persons of wit like Montesquieu and Voltaire" (*Enc* §394 Zus), witty and elegant prose produces much serious thought—though of course not won by reason, that is, by logical development from concepts, but by the dazzling perspicacity of the authors' understanding (*entendement*). Where wit is absent, however, *esprit* becomes the guiding light of babblers, masters of superficiality, and producers of associative thought. Despite the fame achieved by so many French intellectual windbags or *Schwätzer*, however, the history of French political thought is marked on the whole by extraordinary acumen. Especially in moments of great crisis, world reason itself is pleased to come to the aid of French understanding. In the midst of French revolutionary passions, and unbeknownst to factions and individuals consumed by the bloody pursuit of the most terrifying and terroristic abstractions of the understanding, reason always manages to establish among them a superior ethical order "in which all former imbalances in the life of the state *appear* to be removed" (*Enc* §394 Zus, emphasis added).

If the French are a nation of the understanding, the English are a people of rational intuition. They do recognize reason, albeit not in its universal dimension but merely in its singular incarnations. In England, the individual is expected to relate to the universal on his own initiative. This apparently explains the English penchant for self-reliance, their excellence as poets, their lack of excellence in theoretical philosophy, and their proclivity for engaging in business. In a strikingly idealistic inversion of the relation between economic practice and culture, Hegel comments that the importance of commerce in English life is owed to the English conception of social interactions as, essentially, market transactions. With this insight Hegel is giving voice to an association, very common in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature

on civil society, between British life and radical forms of business practices. The Irishman William Thompson (1755–1833), for example, explained the British and North American “system of liberty” (free trade practices on a global scale) in the proto-Marxian terms of “usurpations” and “expedients” that would in turn account, among other things, for the thriving of a trade perpetrated “against one great branch of the human race, because they differ, in a few physical circumstances, chiefly colour” from their proprietors (Thompson 1824, 296). As we learn from Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right*, the logic of a market-centered society like that blossoming in the British islands means that the universal good no longer enjoys objective validity, but is considered a side effect of individuals’ interactions via an abstract universal medium. In the passage of the *Anthropology* at issue here, Hegel does not specify whether the universal medium is the market or money itself. Either way, he appears to be attributing the characteristics of a modern free market-based society to “English” culture rather than simply recognizing Britain as the most advanced embodiment of a much wider historical movement, the postfeudal economies of Europe. The contempt expressed by Shakespeare and Marx for the abstract universality of money and its corrupting influence on social mores is entirely missing from Hegel’s exposition. Neither the “common whore of mankind . . . [the] visible God” that makes the impossible possible by speaking “with every tongue, to every purpose” (*Timon of Athens*, 4.3), nor the universal “procurer” of need satisfaction (Marx 1968; Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 40:563) find echos in this Addition. Hegel’s tone is rather, in an academic sort of way, mildly critical of the commercial mindset of Germany’s neighbor to the north. The target of his disapproval is the political dimension of “intellectual intuition,” namely, the fact that in England rights are still grasped as particular forms of privilege, as matters of local tradition, family inheritance, or even as special rights of political bodies, rather than as universal principles.

Hegel’s attention turns in the end to the German peoples: “Usually the *Germans* mention the Germans last, either out of modesty or because one reserves the best for last” (*Enc* §394 Zus). Dryly, he explains that the bent for thinking things over makes German thinkers appear profound even when, as is often the case, they are just obscure. The painful truth is that, viewing life as they do from the angle of their “secluded spiritual still-life” (*Enc* §394 Zus), Germans tend to ponder the principles of action ad infinitum, and action passes them by. Hegel uses the French adage *le meilleur tue le bien* (the best is the enemy of the good) as an apt description of this cultural condition—a judgment later echoed in the young Marx’s formulation of the same ailment, which he, however, attributes to the backward, rural-feudal conditions of the German states: “We Germans have been in the company of freedom only once, on the day of its burial.”⁹ Moreover, while the German peoples are fond of their collective reputation for loyalty and reliability, Hegel claims, they don’t do much to substantiate this reputation through actual deeds. As

a rule, Germans also tend to ignore the broader political dimension of life. They seek society's recognition through officialdom, in the firm philistine belief "that office and title make the man" (*Enc* §394 Zus). This ludicrous attitude, as the almost garrulous Addition concludes, is matched in Europe only by the Spaniards' obsession with strings of surnames whose length they consider a measure of nobility.

2. Kinship and the Individual: Disposition, Temperament, Character

The natural soul reaches the final stage of its self-differentiations in the plurality of specimens of each kind. From this perspective, the peculiarity of the human kind consists of the fact that what are mild individual deviations from the norm in other animal species become significant variations among human individuals. The single plant is an almost perfect specimen of its kind; the single beast may depart ever so slightly from its species; but the human individual is itself a microcosm of differences and oppositions. This individual is even able to develop "in opposition to itself" (*Enc* §395 Zus), that is, in opposition to the givens of its family, its race, its people, its local spirit. In the next section's Addition, Hegel will specify what this departure from oneself exactly entails. For now, he merely describes its general features: in the all-embracing sea of geological, geographical, and organic history, the animal spirit's placid self-sameness in human beings becomes disrupted by the widening ripples of individualization.

The principal opposition of which human individuals, and only human individuals, are capable is opposition against their own generic animal nature. This is not to be confused with the *Phenomenology's* notion of an "opposition of consciousness." The latter characterizes subjectivity becoming conscious of being opposite to objectivity—prompting Hegel's use of the term *Gegenstand* instead of *Objekt* to denote what stands over against the subject. The study of this meaning of "opposition" does not belong in a speculative anthropology, but in a phenomenology of conscious being (*Bewusstsein*). The latter also includes, of course, the study of self-conscious being (*Selbstbewusstsein*), that is, of an existent that is at once subject and object of itself and thus also stands over against itself. But real spirits or human individuals are not, and certainly do not begin as, purely self-conscious beings. Hence, the introductory part of a philosophy of real spirit must account for conditions that are necessarily presupposed by self-opposing consciousness. The opposition to itself treated in the *Anthropology* refers more simply to natural individuals' activity of distancing themselves from environmental givens. The study of the merely anthropological soul is a study in the becoming of *anthropos*. The task at hand is only to describe the physiospiritual aspects of individual types, not to determine the conditions of moral personhood. Natural

individuals' efforts at self-distinction from their own naturalness also bear witness, of course, to these same individuals' continued dependence upon that from which they aim at separating. Crucially for Hegel, this fundamental dependence is not only one from external natural circumstances—the kind of heteronomy that mostly gets mentioned in these contexts. The heteronomy of natural individuals is also a dependence on their own intrinsic dispositions. Ever since antiquity, the range and kinds of these dispositions have been investigated through empirical and taxonomic means. Hegel's treatment harks back to these traditions.

The astonishing psychological variety of natural individuals who share a common ancestry, customs, family, or ethical life is for Hegel a case of simple or "untrue" infinity (what the *Science of Logic* calls *schlechte Unendlichkeit*), that is, a case of unending reiterations of different finitudes.¹⁰ For descriptive purposes, this unruly multitude must be accommodated—and has been accommodated for two millennia—to fit a handful of "natural" kinds or types.

At the onset, Hegel cautions us to not seek a rational system in any compilation of human singularities, no matter how rich and intriguing it may be. Logic itself teaches that necessity cannot pertain to what is by definition unique and hence also contingent. Necessity only belongs to what is, potentially or actually, universal (*allgemein*),¹¹ while what strikes us at first about human individual differences is precisely their appearance as contingent idiosyncrasies. Scientific or philosophical systematizations cannot capture individual *singularities* but only *individual types*.

The Addition to *Enc* §395 walks us through some time-honored classifications of individual types—a tradition that Hegel sees no reason to amend.¹² With regard to the threefold classification of the qualities of the individual soul (see below), the same Addition also concludes by declaring their "rational necessity." In a move strongly reminiscent of the German proclivity for "falling into formalism" that he has just rebuked in the previous Addition, Hegel declares that individual idiosyncrasies are best explained in the threefold framework of natural disposition (*Naturell*), temperament (*Temperament*), character (*Charakter*), "and no others" (*Enc* §395 Zus). Cautious formulations notwithstanding ("it is customary to assume . . ."), the transcribed text emphasizes the wonderful match between this threefold typology of individual human souls, on the one hand, and the relations of the logical categories of reality, on the other. Natural disposition is the mere being of the individual soul; temperament is its essence; and character—understood as the overarching unity of disposition and temperament—discloses the concept of the individual soul. Remarkably, and despite the strained effort at systematization, there is in this Addition much in which contemporary psychology may recognize itself.

Since antiquity, the empirically inclined have used taxonomy to capture human individual variance. In taxonomy lies, Hegel believes, the true genius

of empiricist theories of experience: despite empiricism's (purported) belief in the uniqueness of individual experience (*Erlebnis*), it never loses itself in singularities. Since no experiential bit ever happens more than once, and no experiential content is ever the same as the next, classification must come to the rescue. Types accommodate similarities and differences; order emerges from chaos; and the comfort of finite categories shuts out the distressing pandemonium of the "untrue infinity" of individual difference. If all distinction is one among types, however, what remains of individual difference? The *Science of Logic* analyzes the logical aspects of "singularity" under the category of Essence. It is one thing to speak of the *numerical* plurality of singular events or individuals, and quite another to state that they are *qualitatively* plural. It was a "happy time for metaphysics" when Leibniz could challenge courtly ladies to find two identical leaves in Queen Sophie Charlotte's garden. The philosopher meant to demonstrate that each thing differs from every other thing. In this sort of experimental metaphysics, identifying difference is a task for merely representational thinking (*vorstellendes Denken*). But multiplicity, Hegel comments, is not the same as difference:

The sentence . . . "no two things are perfectly the same" expresses more, namely *determinate* diversity [*Verschiedenheit*]. Two things are not just two—numerical multiplicity [*Vielheit*] is only the repetition of one—but they differ rather *through a determination* . . . Difference as such in its abstraction is at first indifferent vis-à-vis sameness and lack of sameness . . . But the law of diversity [*Satz der Verschiedenheit*] states that things differ from each other through unlikeness [*Ungleichheit*], that . . . unlikeness belongs to them as much as . . . likeness, because only together do they constitute determinate difference [*Unterschied*]. (WdL W 6:53–54)

Well beyond the leafy multiplicity of Queen Sophie's gardens, the logic of difference among human individuals is one of unlikeness-in-likeness. It is *determinate* difference or "diversity" (*Verschiedenheit*). This logic applies to human individuals not just insofar as they are numerically *and* qualitatively distinct specimens of the same kind. It applies to them, more significantly, insofar as they are self-determining or self-distinguishing individuals.

The typology discussed in the Addition to §395 is meant to capture qualitative variations in attitudes and capacities; but individual nature also changes as a function of the temporal stages of one's life span. Hegel calls the qualitative variations "abstract" distinctions (by which he means in this context not just one-sided distinctions but also doubtful ones) of natural individual types. These are treated under the title "a. a. Natural Qualities." Differences that accrue as functions of time, that is, of developmental stages and cyclic life-rhythms, are discussed in §§396–98 (including Remarks and Additions) under the title "a. β. Natural Changes." The third differentiation

of living individuality (a. γ.) results from the unity of qualities and changes in the individual soul: it is the capacity for sentience. This deserves to be treated separately (see chapter 6).

Even here, Hegel's order of exposition is anything but casual: one must start from what seems to be entirely of nature's doing so as to be able to leave behind naturalism's explanatory dead end, and eventually succeed in accounting for features that individuals can only have acquired through spiritual accomplishments: experience, education, and the formation of the will.

Hegel defines the concept of *natural disposition* negatively: it denotes all that would be left of individuals if it were possible to remove from consideration what they become in their ethical world. Such an abstraction, of course, is a real impossibility. The natural endowments so crucial to the Romantic worldview, namely individual talent and genius, fall exactly under this abstract category. These refer to a capacity to excel in particular activities (talent) or to create altogether new avenues of human pursuits (genius). Talent is the potential to produce excellence in an existing cultural domain; genius is the potential to create a new one or, as Kant put it: "*Genius* [*Genie*] is the inborn disposition (*ingenium*) through which nature gives to art the rule . . . (wherefore the word *Genie* is probably derived from *genius*, the peculiar, . . . protective and guiding spirit given to a human being at birth)" (Kant 1963 §46, 307–8). While Hegel agrees that nature is responsible for endowing a few individuals with these capacities, he stresses that a whole ethical world is needed for their actualization. The only evidence of the existence of talent or genius is the actual existence of works of talent or genius. And for these to come into being, there must be an already existing ethical world in which music, mathematics, art, science, engineering, and poetry may unfold. Merely latent natural dispositions only become real through the hard work of cultivation—not just individual education, but an entire culture's development—and through that work's results. That is why precocity is not a reliable sign of the presence of genius. Without explicitly mentioning the career of Friedrich Schelling, precocious youth, former friend, and past coauthor, Hegel warns against misreading early brilliance as a promise of later genius—especially in philosophy: "In philosophy, naked genius does not lead very far; here genius must subject itself to the strict discipline of logical thinking. Only through this submission is it possible for genius in this field to attain perfect freedom" (*Enc* §395 Zus). More importantly, natural endowment has no bearing on one's moral personality. Ethical behavior and virtue are "nothing inborn," since they are grounded in the capacity for thought, that is, for concepts, and are thus strangers to the givenness of preconceptual endowment—whatever this may be. Rendered possible only by freedom, virtue is a result of personal exertion. It is not a status but an activity where nature, while not absent, is a muted presence: "Differences in natural disposition therefore are of no importance for the doctrine of virtue" (*Enc* §395 Zus). It is worth noting here that in this regard Hegel distances

himself decisively from ancient Greek conceptions of ethicality, to which he is otherwise profoundly indebted. J. K. Dover gives an original and well-documented discussion of Greek conceptions of the interplay of *phusis* and *nomos* in individual behavior (Dover 1994, esp. 88–95). He convincingly shows that the ancient Greek mind is best understood by including orators, comedy writers, historians, graffiti writers, lawyers, and popular juries' verdicts in one's consideration of the better-known views or official doctrines of the major philosophers. Contrary to Hegel, for most Greeks of the classical age natural disposition played a huge role in one's capacity for virtue.

Beyond distinguishing natural disposition from ethical capacities, Hegel stresses that among the many conceptions of natural dispositions, those of "talent" and "genius" are of most recent pedigree. There does not appear to be a concept of individual genius in extant Greek literature—a fact all the more striking since we are accustomed to viewing the classical epoch (and the pre-Socratic era) as one blessed with stunning numbers of individuals endowed with unique intellectual abilities who were able to create entirely new kinds of human endeavor—not least, philosophy itself. And yet, while in ancient literature there is plenty of talk of *sophia* and *sophrone* in contexts where we would sometimes speak of extraordinary ability, intelligence, and perhaps talent, there is no reference to mathematical, scientific, artistic, or philosophical "geniuses." On occasion, Greek texts attribute wisdom and practical and theoretical intelligence to exceptional individuals as representatives of outstanding civilizations—mostly, of course, that of Athens (on this see Dover 1994, 116–26). Yet these notions don't even come close to the modern Romantic conception of inborn, ineffable, unrecognized individual genius. Socrates's *daimōn*, despite its common Latin translation as *genius*, does not qualify as an ancient example of the modern conception because it does not refer to inborn, let alone creative or extraordinary, abilities.¹³ The only connection between the meanings of *daimōn* and *genius* is aptly explained by Kant: "The reason why the exemplary originality of talent is being labeled with this mystical name [i.e., *Genie*] lies in the fact that whoever possesses it can neither explain . . . nor make comprehensible to himself the upsurges of it" (Kant 2000, 225). This is exactly what Socrates claims in regard to his *daimōn*.

The notion of individual *temperament* has a much longer pedigree than that of natural disposition. Naturalistic doctrines of individual preferences and aversions (or attractions and repulsions) emerged in the age of Pericles through the medical studies of Hippocrates of Cos (460–370 B.C.). This philosopher of the body, or *physikos*, found disease to be a body's internal discordance, a corporeal civil war (in today's terminology, an autoimmune disorder) among its basic humors: blood, phlegm, black bile, and yellow bile. Five centuries later, Galen of Pergamum (A.D. 129–216) developed this traditional foursome in a psychological direction: he tied each humor to a human temperament. With variations, this connection remained very much

unchallenged throughout the Arabic and European Middle Ages and the Renaissance. As Hegel points out, the pagan doctrine of the four temperaments spread even more widely on account of its ethical-political articulation in Plato's *Republic* as the wisdom, courage, moderation, and justice of the *kallipolis* (*Republic*, bk. IV, 427e–435). The doctrine eventually found its way into Christian moral philosophy, chiefly through Augustine and Aquinas. Here it reemerged in the guise of the four cardinal virtues proper to the ideal Christian: prudence, courage, temperance, and justice.

At its inception, however, the idea of the four humors and their role in the psyche was solidly physicalistic. As *phusikoi*, the followers of Hippocrates understood that live matter cannot but be part of the cosmos. Thus, the earliest fourfold division of the world's elements—the hot, the dry, the wet, and the cold—must apply *mutatis mutandis* to living bodies. As suggested in an exchange in Plato's *Phaedrus*, cosmic, bodily, and psychic principles can only be grasped as belonging together, whether by analogy or by some other method: “[*Socrates*:] Do you think it possible, then, satisfactorily to comprehend the nature of the soul apart from the nature of the universe? [*Phaedrus*:] Nay, if we are to believe Hippocrates, of the Asclepiad family, we cannot learn even about the body unless we follow this method of procedure” (*Phaedrus* 270c). The study of the living body, in other words, is the study of the middle term between the soul and the universe.

Galen identified the elemental humors as blood, phlegm, choler (replacing Hippocrates's black bile), and yellow bile. Thus, for this personal physician to Roman emperors—socially isolated patients who exhibited a number of well-defined, often psychotic behaviors—the human soul displays four basic temperaments: the sanguine, the phlegmatic, the choleric, and the melancholic.

For Hegel, whatever the basic categorizations prevailing at one time or another, the common trait of all doctrines of temperaments is that they are theories of types of individual responses to shared circumstances. Despite its apparent gratuitousness, the allure of hypothesizing a limited number of well-definable temperaments lasted in Western culture well into the nineteenth century and, in new garb, into our own. This may or may not be a testimony to its explanatory power *vis-à-vis* common experience (flat-earth convictions have lasted as long). Hegel, at any rate, is highly skeptical of the four-temperament doctrine. He thinks that the doctrine's longevity is largely a function of its genericity. He also considers it increasingly irrelevant for historical reasons:

It is difficult to say what one means by temperament . . . Temperament is no longer as important as previously believed . . . In a time of higher cultivation [*Bildung*] . . . the difference of temperaments gets lost . . . The attempted distinctions of temperament are so indeterminate that one knows not how to apply them . . . , as these temperaments are found more or less unified in individuals. (*Enc* §395 Zus)

From this perspective, the notion of temperament is even more nebulous than that of natural disposition. While “talent” and “genius,” for example, can at least give magnificent proof of their presence through inventions and masterpieces, individual temperament appears to be a purely internal condition of the individual, and that means, purely a relation to oneself. Temperament may best be defined as one’s attitude toward one’s own life and environment; but the more pervasive the social world’s encroachment on the individual’s life, as in modern civil society, the weaker is the role played by one’s temperament, or indeed by natural endowments of any sort.¹⁴ This is how the Griesheim transcription of this Addition describes the intrusion of civil society on what we assume to be the “nature” of individuals:

In a civilized rational environment [the temperaments] recede. The phlegmatic individual is being stimulated on all sides, must deal with a multitude of things . . . A sanguine person is burdened with the need to . . . persevere in this or that business, office, obligation; the melancholic is dragged out of himself because the civilized condition does not tolerate the inner broodings of sensitivity. The choleric has to temper outbursts in order to make his activity . . . suitable to what counts as custom. (*Enc* §395 Zus, Griesheim MS in Hegel 1978, trans. Petry, 2:89)

Rather than being a reflection of universal anthropological types, the theory of the four temperaments may perhaps be a loose description of individuals in premodern societies. It fails to describe individual realities in the later stages of societal development. To Hegel, the four-temperaments model of the ancients appears to be rather an extrapolation from successful literary devices that reflected and exaggerated the relatively stable assignation of individuals to social roles. In the self-contained world of the Greek poetic arts, figures tend to embody temperamental stereotypes: the completely virtuous, the wholly debauched, the hopelessly ignorant, the immaculately beautiful, the hideously revolting individual. But in societies with a broader outlook, Hegel writes, “the totally reckless, the ludicrously absent-minded, the filthy miser” (*Enc* §395 Zus) give way to more nuanced characters. This is because modern civil society compels individuals to develop a kind of pliability (whose darker side is their manipulability) that was never required of them in previous history. It is safe to assume that the more complex the ethical world, the greater the mix of temperaments in each individual.

If compared with contemporary standard models of personality, Hegel’s take on the classical theories of temperament is remarkably skeptical. Today’s leading models in psychology assume the existence of four, or sometimes five innate temperaments.¹⁵ Whatever the latest number, temperaments are thought of as endogenous capacities to regulate four types of responses to the social environment: cognitive, affective, instinctual (“impulsivity”), and

nervous reactions (“anxiety”). Contemporary physicalistic models in psychology ground these claims, of course, in theories of brain chemistry. It would have come as no surprise to Galen, then, that the four recognized individual behavioral types are now said to be triggered by—though epistemologically savvy psychiatrists just use the term “reflect”—the activities of four, no more and no less, endogenous “humors”: four neurotransmitters in the brain. We are thus told that the strength or weakness of our cognitive, affective, impulsive, or anxious responses to the world depends on interactions among dopamine, norepinephrine, serotonin, and one amino acid. The following reflection of a leading contemporary proponent of this theory is an excellent commentary on the scientific status of current research on temperament and personality: “This example also demonstrates that while the presumed *physiology* of personality variations has changed since antiquity . . . the conceptual approach remains remarkably similar” (Cohen 2003, 64). Hegel’s skepticism about the scientific basis of temperament doctrines probably understates the situation.

Character, finally, is the quality of individuals that is considered to be least rooted in nature. Hegel defines it as the confluence of three elements: vigor in the pursuit of goals, subjective conviction about their importance, and the objective worth of the goals being pursued. The latter is a *sine qua non* for attributing character to a person, since individuals may well pursue utterly worthless ends with energy and conviction, in which case they are not said to display strong character but its parody, obstinacy.

As Petry points out (Hegel 1978, 2:468–70), Hegel stands alone among his contemporaries in maintaining that the physiological determinants of familial and individual peculiarities—whether dispositions, temperaments, or characters—are inescapably bound up with social determinants. On the one hand, Hegel does acknowledge that nature plays a preponderant role in phenomena like the prodigious endowments of some children with respect to musical or mathematical capacities. (Possibly with Carl Gauss in mind, Hegel mentions “the unbelievable speed of mental arithmetic in some children”; *Enc* §395 Zus.) Nature also plays a role in certain individuals’ hypersensitivity to particular objects, to which they react with spontaneous “antipathy” (the word “allergy” having come into use only in the twentieth century). On the other hand, whenever *human* nature is in play, social reality cannot be far behind. Thus Hegel stresses the necessity that particular social realities be in existence—a civil society, educational institutions, a musical culture, for example—for prodigious natural endowments to come to the surface; and just as he did in the discussion of the Portuguese colonists’ apparently darkening skin in their African settlements (discussed earlier in chapter 4), here he hints at the probability that clusters of “idiosyncrasies,” since they run in families, might have to be explained by physical inheritance mediated by social-sexual mores. This would explain why, Hegel informs his audience, such peculiarities are found especially in Swiss and German towns “where

[people] have not bound themselves in marriage to outsiders but simply with one another" (*Enc* §395 Zus).

Character, however, is more than a social attitude combined with natural endowment. It unifies the stability of one's natural disposition with the variability of one's temperament. In character, the outward-directedness of natural disposition coalesces with the inward (self-relating) quality of temperament. Therefore, when we speak of "strength" or "stability" of character, we do not refer to the stability of a natural disposition, but to conduct made possible by a developed will: "This is why we have been justified in talking about character here, in the *Anthropology*, despite the fact that character attains its full development only in the sphere of spirit that is free" (*Enc* §395 Zus).

3. Kinship and the Individual: Age, Sexuality, and the Patterns of Life

If the soul is a phase in the process of spirit, then the qualities of the soul must be moments of a becoming, that is, its qualities are not traits so much as patterns of change. In order to fully grasp the so-called nature of individuals we must grasp them as living units, hence in their becoming. Individual types can therefore be best discerned at the intersection of their qualities and changes. Hegel dedicates the next three sections of the *Anthropology* (§§396–98: "a. β . Natural Changes") to the time-dependent alterations to which the human individual is subject: the ages (a. β 1), the sexual capacities (a. β 2), and the cyclic rhythms (a. β 3) of individual life.

In animal life, change appears primarily as a continuum of physical and psychical phases of individual development and decay appropriate to and determined by the individual's kind. In humans, we recognize these same phases as age-appropriate forms of physiology and personality. The theory of individual changes that Hegel develops in these three sections once again illustrates a central principle of the *Anthropology*: the soul is at once the last shape (*morphē*) of nature and the first form (*eidos*) of spirit. All purely naturalistic or purely social accounts of individual change—today's "either evolutionary¹⁶ or nurture-oriented" accounts—are therefore one-sided and hence untrue. Hegel also warns repeatedly that the natural age-characteristics of the individual, the phases of sexuality, and the daily patterns of life can be fully explained only from the subsequent vantage point of evolved, no longer just natural spirit:

If they are determinations of the soul as *individual*, then differences are *changes* to the latter, to the *one* subject that endures in them, and *moments* of its development. Since they are physical and spiritual differences in *one*, in order to more concretely determine or describe them, one would have to anticipate acquaintance with the already cultivated spirit [*gebildeter Geist*]. (*Enc* §396)

Despite his own words of caution, what Hegel actually does in the Addition dedicated to the temporal segments of individual life goes a lot further than simply adopting the perspective of more advanced stages of subjective spirit in order to explain what precedes them. The transcribed text actually projects onto allegedly natural phases of subjective spirit features of a historically specific form of objective spirit, namely, the ideal features of members of civil society and of the modern (nuclear) family.

To begin with, Hegel guides us through the developmental stages—all of them physiopsychological—of individual life. Philosophically, two aspects of developmental psychology as it applies to human and nonhuman animals alike are particularly relevant. First is the trivial but often-ignored truth that the segments of life's arc are never unique to individuals. Rather, they are markers of species-specific changes that manifest themselves in individuals. Individuals are not absolute singularities but always specimens of a species. Each carries its genus within itself. Using the later idiom of Ludwig Feuerbach, we could say that Hegel's characterization of individuals in physiopsychological perspective is that of a plurality of *Gattungswesen*: entities whose essence is their species.

To avoid naturalistic reductions of Hegel's conception of *human* individuality it is vital to note that the world-soul's final self-differentiations result precisely in individuals' entering into opposition against their common and undifferentiated source:

As the completely universal soul particularizes, and eventually singularizes or individualizes itself in the way we have described, the soul enters into opposition against its own inward universality, against its substance. This contradiction of the immediate singularity and the substantial universality present in the individual soul grounds its life process—a process by which the soul's immediate singularity is made to correspond to the universal, realizes the latter in the former, raises the first simple unity of the soul with itself to a unity mediated by opposition . . . (Enc §396 Zus)

From this follows the second crucial aspect of human individual development: the progression from birth to old age is marked by the temporal sequence of the *Geschlechtsverhältnis*, the dynamic relation (*Verhältnis*) of a natural individual to his or her species.

In the following, Hegel makes liberal use of the term *Gattung*. Depending on the context, this must be translated here now as “species” and now as “genus.” The first is more apt in contexts in which the biological connotation prevails; the second is more apt wherever the cultural connotation is of the essence. The terms *Gattung* (logical genus or biological species) and *Art* (logical type or form, biological kind or variety, sometimes “species” as a subcategory of genus) began to be distinguished from one another only in

the course of the eighteenth century and only in scientific contexts. The two terms were often switched in German just as in English letters: *Menschenart* may stand for *menschliche Gattung* just as “mankind” may stand for “the human species.” Hegel, of course, broadens the employment of genus or kind to include relations in the sphere of spirit: “What genus [*Gattung*] is to the living as such, rationality [*Vernünftigkeit*] is to the spiritual” (*Enc* §396 Zus). But in the present context, he confines his discussion of *Gattung* to the psychophysiological dimensions of human life.

The age-defining relations of individuals to their species are altogether oppositional relationships—Hegel even speaks of “contradiction”—between the ephemeral singularity of specimens and the substantial universality of the species. Natural individuals’ lives are asymptotic approximations of their own essence, that is, of the concept of their species; one may also say, conversely, that the concept of the species finds increasing actualization in the individual who progresses toward maturity: “This developmental process is the individual’s formation [*die Bildung*]. Even what lives merely as animal [*das bloss animalisch Lebendige*] exemplifies in its own way this process” (*Enc* §396 Zus).

The originally abstract universality of the world-soul, of vegetable seed, or of the animal fetus passes over into the increasingly concrete, internally articulated totality of self-standing individuals. Here, Hegel calls this natural passage from abstract to concrete universality simply *die Bildung*. In this instance the term does not mean acculturation, let alone education. It is meant literally as a *forming* of individuality out of the abstract universality of the species—in Petry’s discerning translation: “This process of development constitutes the formation of the soul” (Hegel 1978, trans. Petry, 2:97). And indeed, the sentence quoted in the last paragraph reminds us that all animals, not just humans, go through the same formative or “educational” process. The single animal does not have the power to completely realize the species in itself. It is because of this intrinsic incapacity that the animal will eventually pass away. Hegel has already expounded this argument in the *Philosophy of Nature*. Insofar as humans are animals, this logic applies to them as well. Our species affirms itself in a natural way in the death of each of us.

Humans, however, also become individualized in a dimension other than their animality:

By contrast, the [human] genus [*Gattung*] actualizes itself truly in spirit, in thinking, this element homogeneous to it. Yet in the anthropological sphere this actualization still occurs in a naturalistic mode, since it affects the natural individual spirit. Hence it takes place in time. In this way surfaces . . . a series of changes . . . that appear in one and the same individual as fluid and overlapping forms. (*Enc* §396 Zus)

The main spiritual phases in a human’s relation to its genus become explicit in the stages of childhood, youth, maturity, and old age.

Like a coil not yet unwound, childhood is the time of “spirit still wrapped in itself” (*Enc* §396). At times, children show their potential to antagonize objectivity, but in the main they thrive in unreflected unity with it. The prevalent mode of the individual in childhood is one of full, positive acceptance of reality as it is found. In youth, spirit uncoils and the individual runs into tensions between extremes: his own radically subjective interests on the one hand, and the equally radical objective interests of the world, on the other. This “incomplete individual” tends to misunderstand his own interests as universal, while he views the world as a collection of particular interests without rhyme or reason. “He” (Hegel’s *Jüngling*, “boy,” is the developmental paradigm here; the potentially different development of the child into a girl, *Mädchen*, does not figure at all) is often dominated by feelings of outrage at the world’s inadequacies to his own ideals—for example, the deficiency of what is vis-à-vis what ought to be.

Beyond this social attitude to one’s world, Hegel briefly mentions a more natural occurrence in this age: “The boy matures into the youth with the onset of puberty when the life of the *species* [*Gattung*] begins to stir in him and to seek satisfaction” (*Enc* §396 Zus). Only one sentence is devoted to this momentous stage. The next section, dedicated to the *Geschlechtsverhältnis*, the “sexual condition” or primal relation of individuals to their species, will say little more about the inner stirring of the species’ sexual urges in the individual.

Using the philosophically uncommon, gender specific word *Mann* instead of *Mensch*, Hegel states that in his maturity the male individual naturally winds up recognizing the rational aspects of precisely that which earlier provoked his youthful outrage. This individual now engages the objective world in a constructive manner, namely by becoming a working member of society and hence gaining, so says Hegel, “proof of his worth” (*Enc* §396 Zus). In old age, finally, the individual naturally reverts back to a kind of unity with the objective world that is reminiscent of childhood’s cocoon-like contentment, while also differing from it in one all-important way. Old age’s contentment is no longer the immediate serenity of childhood, but a comfort mediated by habituation. To become old, Hegel notes, is to make a habit of life.

There is enough here to make readers (Young Left Hegelians and others) bristle with indignation. The portrayal of the logic of what are presented as natural stages and transitions in the individual soul reads like an ideological distillate of bourgeois life, untroubled by hardships and impediments because built entirely on a foundation of material comfort and secured social standing. In these pages, nature itself appears to be perfectly at ease in the idealized setting of the Middle-European bourgeois family. Children thrive naturally in the bosom of a mild-mannered family of means. Youth is naturally rebellious on account of its extreme “subjective idealism” (*Enc* §396 Zus)—understood here, of course, not as Kantian philosophy but as subjectivist reverie. This idealism pits the youth against a world he perceives to be

devoid of ideals—most prominently, as wanting in justice. The subsequent transition to maturity, Hegel acknowledges with a measure of condescending cynicism, can be “a painful transition into philistine life [*Philisterleben*]” (*Enc* §396 *Zus*). It can even lead to “hypochondria.”¹⁷ The mature individual, however, naturally reconciles himself with philistine life, not to mention the want of justice in the world, in exchange for a chance to participate in it. By this move he attains social recognition (“actual presence”) and, perhaps more crucially, “objective value”—one must presume, by earning an income. In old age, finally, the individual settles into freedom from “narrow-minded interests” (*Enc* §396 *Zus*),¹⁸ no doubt those endured in his working life, and from external encumbrances. The soul, Hegel appears to be saying, is now serenely reconciled with objectivity, that is, with the rational substrate of civil society’s otherwise hypochondria-inducing and morally repugnant philistinism.

Even for tested Hegel readers, the leap from a discussion of the natural stages of individual development to a survey of their Victorian bourgeois incarnations is bold. This perhaps explains why Hegel repeats at the closing of the Addition the self-exculpatory remark that opens the main text of this section: by a necessity that is intrinsic to the subject matter, he stresses, discerning the natural stages of individuals is only possible from a perspective that is no longer that of nature. And since the soul’s developments are at once physical and spiritual, the view from the cultivated stages of the soul’s formation might inevitably obscure their natural foundations. Despite this disclaimer, however, the fact remains that Hegel’s disquisitions on the “natural” contentment of childhood, the “natural” antagonism of youth, the “natural” adaptation of maturity to the status quo, and the “natural” tranquillity of old age do more than just obscure the question of human development. They rather project idealized arrangements of modern civil society onto human nature in general. The thriving of childhood in the affable and financially stable bourgeois family; the confinement of political passion to the naturally naive, sentimental, easily vexed, and insufficiently insightful youth; the mature (male) individual’s voluntary self-integration in the “state of need and of the understanding” despite its being, as we are told in the *Philosophy of Right*, a system that fosters wealth and selfishness on the one hand, deprivation and loss of dignity on the other (*RPh* §§189–245); the tangible rewards of such appeasement in the form of status recognition and “objective value”; and finally, the untroubled contentment of well-cared-for elders—all these are presented as forming the standard pattern of human life. It is hard indeed to read this text as something other than a glaring case of the ideological naturalization or “reification” of the ideals of a particular historical society, and of a particular class in it, made into emblems of universal human development.

There are, of course, in Hegel’s text several insights that are more valuable than the simple projection of bourgeois society onto anthropological nature.

In particular, Hegel's discussion of early childhood, the least cultured stage of individual development, is rich in lessons on the difference between ancient and modern perceptions and treatment of children; on the pivotal role of imitative behavior in the very young; on the primary function of play, including the breaking of toys, thanks to which "never again does the human being learn as much as in this period of life" (*Enc* §396 *Zus*); on the misguided (according to Hegel) assumptions of the then-new pedagogies of learning through play;¹⁹ and on the role of schooling in the life of the modern child. Only a few of the more properly anthropological arguments pertaining to this most natural phase of human life need to be discussed here.

Hegel detects three or four mileposts in childhood—four, to quote him, "if we wish to take into consideration the unborn child, identical with the mother" (*Enc* §396 *Zus*). The first is the vegetative subsistence of the fetus, an entity that despite being a single organism is not yet an individual. The unborn lives a "fully oppositionless life" because its subsistence is entirely symbiotic upon the life of another. The fetus absorbs the environment, not by intermittently imbibing food and inhaling air with specific organs of its body—"not by behaving in a particular way to particular objects"²⁰—but simply, and more plant-like, by continuous assimilation. The second moment is the newborn's life, which begins with the "tremendous leap" (*Enc* §396 *Zus*) of birth. In birth the human organism is catapulted into the animal mode, a mode of existence characterized by the organism's urge to dissociate itself from the surroundings on which it nevertheless fully depends. The newborn is no longer symbiotic with its setting; it now actively relates itself to it through the mediums of light, air, and food. More importantly, this transition from plant-like to animal life is marked by the new spontaneous movement of breathing, the "inhaling and exhaling of the air at a singular point of its body, [a movement] that interrupts the elemental flow" (*Enc* §396 *Zus*). The new child strives to both separate from and relate itself to its environs as well as to its bodily extremities. In the not-so-distant future, this newly emerged unity of repulsive and attractive urges ("the negative, simple unity of life") will give rise to the blueprint of selfhood, the feeling of self (*Selbstgefühl*). And despite the appearance of helplessness afforded by the human newborn in comparison to those of other species, "its higher nature announces itself" by the "wild, raging, imperious" (*Enc* §396 *Zus*) way in which these creatures, unique in the animal kingdom, manifest their recalcitrance and neediness through screaming (*Schreien*):

While the animal is mute or expresses its pain only through moaning, the child utters the feeling of its needs through *screaming*. Through this ideal activity,²¹ the child at once shows itself pervaded by the certitude of having a right to demand need satisfaction from the external world—or the certainty that the independence of the latter vis-à-vis the human being is a nullity. (*Enc* §396 *Zus*)

The new child progresses from being merely sensitive to light and darkness, a condition that does not include the perception of depth; to tactile sensitivity, by which it acquires spatial orientation; to the intuitive or optical measuring (*Augenmass*)²² of spatial depth; and eventually to the discovery of the externality and resistance of bodies in space. The third stage is childhood proper (or rather, for Hegel, boyhood: *Knabenalter*). Now the individual develops a practical attitude toward the world through both involuntary and voluntary bodily activities like teething, standing, walking, and learning to speak. Of all the details of Hegel's reckoning with the individual development in this Addition, the most striking and relevant for an understanding of our anthropological selves are perhaps the few incisive lines he dedicates to the erect posture:

The erect posture is peculiar to humans and can only be brought about by their will; the human being stands only insofar as it wills to do so; we collapse as soon as we no longer will to stand; the erect posture is therefore the habit of the will to stand. (*Enc* §396 Zus)

Hegel is arguing here against contemporaneous explanations of the upright posture that attributed this unique deportment exclusively to the mechanics of human anatomy. These explanations had already been discredited by Pietro Moscati, royal anatomist at the University of Pavia, whose 1770 study *Delle corporee differenze essenziali che passano fra la struttura de' bruti, e la umana* (*On the Essential Bodily Differences between the Structure of Animals and of Human Beings*)²³ had been reviewed the following year by none other than Immanuel Kant:

Here we have natural man brought back onto all fours by a sharp dissector in a way that insightful Rousseau as philosopher did not succeed in doing. Dr. Moscati demonstrates that the erect gait of human beings is constrained and unnatural, that the human being, though built to make his perseverance and motion in this position possible, by turning it into a necessity and constant habit, [causes] discomforts and consequent illnesses, which sufficiently proves that human beings have been enticed by reason and imitation to deviate from the first, animal constitution. (Kant 1969a, 423)

In other words: while four-leggedness is nature's best anatomical arrangement for humans' preservation, yet on account of the "seed of reason also laid down in them" (Kant 1969a, 425), humans are destined to sociability, which prompts the adoption of the posture most appropriate to face-to-face encounters or communication: two-leggedness. This source of innumerable advantages over the brutes, however, also plagues the human individual with all the discomforts and illnesses (according to Moscati and Kant, birthing complications,

aneurisms, palpitations, dropsy, goiter and more) that accompany “his holding his head so proudly above his old companions” (Kant 1969a, 425).

Kant’s “seed of reason” is found again in Hegel’s “natural will” that motivates us to hold the erect posture despite and against the mechanics of our body. Kant’s and Hegel’s accounts are also an implicit refutation of soon-to-come purely physicalistic evolutionary explanations, some of which are still regarded as scientifically sound to our day. Until recently, classical evolutionary accounts considered anatomical change, resulting from random mutation and environmentally necessitated selection, as being the necessary and sufficient condition, that is, the exhaustive cause, of the upright posture. Newer studies in physical anthropology,²⁴ however, acknowledge the considerable difficulties encountered by these explanations of our species’ transition to bipedalism. One question (among others) that anatomy-based explanations cannot answer is why daily rest from uprightness is necessary to restore the body’s strength—something that should not be the case if the erect posture was the most fitting for human anatomy. These newer studies, which are equally in tune with Kant’s “rational sociability” argument as with Hegel’s “natural will” view, find further corroboration in recent paleoanthropological findings and neurological studies of posture and gait control, of energy expenditure, and of evolutionary psychology. All these acknowledge what Hegel mentions only fleetingly (once in this Addition to §396 and a second time in §411) because he considers this claim to be an easily recognized truth: factors other than pure mechanics must play a crucial role in our species’ adopting and maintaining a daytime erect posture.

In Hegel’s view, then, the human species’ response to need (for example, the need of food gatherers to walk upright in open grasslands or shallow waters) is not *immediately* or purely physical but is always also *mediated* by practical intelligence: the natural will. This ought not to be conflated, of course, with the abstract universal “*free will which wills the free will*” of the *Philosophy of Right* (RPh §27), nor with its concrete realization in self-conscious individuals (detailed in RPh §§4–28).²⁵ The natural will to adopt the upright stance as second nature represents the sort of prerational practical conduct of individuals vis-à-vis their surroundings already discussed in the *Philosophy of Nature*. This individual way of relating to the environment begins

with the feeling of *deficiency* and with the *drive* to sublate it . . . But a *limitation* is a *deficiency* insofar as there is present in the *one* also the *being-beyond that* [limitation], insofar as the *contradiction* as such is immanent . . . in it. An entity that is capable of having and *sustaining* the contradiction of itself in itself is [a] *subject*. (PhN Enc §359)

The practical feeling of deficiency and of the need to overcome it translates into the individual animal’s adaptation to and assimilation of externality.

This is a goal-directed, preconscious process that deserves to be characterized as a “natural form” of the will. But because it is natural, it is still unfree:

The practical process is indeed alteration and sublation of external inorganic nature . . . , and yet still a process of unfreedom, because in its animal appetency the organism is turned entirely outward. The human being thinks of itself as free at first insofar as it is an entity that wills [*als Wille*]; but this is precisely a state in which it relates to what is real, externality; it is first in the rational will, which is the theoretical . . . that the human being is free. (*PhN Enc* §359 Zus)

Other great apes use the upright stance occasionally and in short spurts, yet they do not make it their natural habit. They have shared the same environment with the earliest human beings without ever evolving the habitual posture that enables the latter to stand, to walk, and even to outrun all other animals over long distances.²⁶ Anticipating the explication of the soul’s taking charge of the body in habituation, which he will give in §409 and §410, Hegel aims here to highlight the necessary role of spirit in its form as will in any rational explanation of our species’ peculiar behavior. That human anatomy is the enabler but not the sufficient cause of the erect posture (so much so that when we tire of it, we lay our body down) is but one piece of evidence for the self-produced second nature of our species:

The human being is not erect by nature or innately; it straightens up through the energy of its will; and although its standing, once a habit, no longer needs any further effort of voluntary activity, still this standing must continue to be sustained by our will, lest we should sink down at once. (*Enc* §411 Zus)



The individual psyche is not just altered as a function of age. Individuals also hold difference and opposition within themselves in every phase of their development. Fundamental in this regard is their dynamic relation to the species: *das Geschlechtsverhältnis*,²⁷ literally the “sexual condition” understood as a relationship of individuals to their species, or “sexuality” for short. This moment in the life cycle of individuals (a. β 2: *Enc* §397) is given conspicuously short shrift in the *Anthropology*. Instead, the *Philosophy of Nature*, where sexuality is treated under the general heading “The Species-Process,” explains at some length in what sense natural individuals are living contradictions, insofar as each is the singular actualization of a universal concept, its species. This contradiction is the ground of the individual’s experiencing its singularity as a deficit, as well as the ground of its urge to overcome this deficit: the “feeling of *deficiency* and . . . the *drive* to sublimate

it” quoted above (*PhN Enc* §359) that characterize the practical activity of any animal.

Despite Hegel’s laconic treatment of this “moment” of natural spirit, ideas of the self-oppositional nature of individuals, of their sensing of an existential limitation, and of their urge to overcome it in sexuality have received vivid and much-celebrated treatments in the history of philosophy—most prominently and famously in Plato’s *Symposium*. In that dialogue, Plato first makes Diotima describe the intrinsic oppositional nature of individuals in the plainest of terms and with regard to animal nature in general—not unlike the perspective Hegel adopts in the *Philosophy of Nature*:

Now, why reproduction? It is because reproduction goes on forever; it is what mortals have in place of immortality . . . Don’t you see what an awful state a wild animal is in when it wants to reproduce? . . . What do you think causes love and desire, Socrates? Among animals the principle is the same as with us, and mortal nature seeks so far as possible to live forever and be immortal. And this is possible in one way only: by reproduction. (*Symposium* 206e–207d)²⁸

Hegel’s own version of the same subject matter in the *Philosophy of Nature* entails that, while the species does not exist except in specimens, the specimen is nothing if not the ever-incomplete actualization of all that the concept of its species entails. The final evidence that the subjectively perceived limitation of being individual is also an objective determinacy of individuality is that individuals must perish. Death is at once the logical corollary and the biological consequence of being a single living organism. Yet the inward contradiction of the individual is not only logical and not just proven in death. It makes another dramatic appearance in the life cycle, namely, in the individual’s striving for reproduction—or in Diotima’s words, for immortality. Hegel introduces this subject matter (the second of the individual soul’s changes) by defining sexuality as “the moment of the real opposition of the individual against itself so that it seeks and finds *itself* in *another* individual—*sexuality*, a natural difference, on the one hand, of subjectivity, . . . and *on the other*, of activity” (*Enc* §397). Sexuality is therefore an externally as well as inwardly directed relating of individuals—a centrifugal as much as a centripetal force. This is, again, a variation upon the theme of the Aristophanic tale from the *Symposium*—a much richer story and commentary on the *Geschlechtsverhältnis* than the meager twelve lines allotted to it in Hegel’s text. This paucity of space is all the more striking since Hegel himself assigns to sexuality the systematic position of the middle of three self-alterations of the soul, making it therefore into the pivot around which turn the life and death of natural individuals.

As told by Plato, the story goes that today’s individuals are only the halves of originally whole humans, each equipped with two faces, eight limbs, and

two sets of genitalia, the latter paired in the only three combinations that mathematics makes possible: both female, both male, or female and male. “There were three kinds of human beings, . . . not two as there are now . . . ; there was a third, a combination of those two . . . At that time, you see, the word ‘androgynous’ really meant something” (*Symposium* 189d–e). But the hubris of these all-round, double-sexed, self-sufficient individuals roused the wrath of Zeus who, rather than exterminate them (and hence risk the loss of sacrificial gifts) chose to weaken their strength by doubling their number. Hence, the divine father slashed each human in two “the way people cut sorb apples before they dry them” (*Symposium* 190e). Ever since, each of us harbors a desire for her or his lost half—some women desire women, some men desire men, and all others desire their opposites: “Love is the name for our pursuit of wholeness, for our desire to be complete” (*Symposium* 193). In a poetically, satirically, and politically charged context,²⁹ Plato’s Aristophanes makes it explicit that sexuality consists of a double relation: a desire for a lost dimension of one’s own, and a desire for one other than oneself. Contrary to the framework of Hegel’s discussion, however, there is in Plato no hint that the desire for completeness is tied to the reproductive imperatives of the *genos*:

And so, when this boy lover³⁰ . . . meets the half that is his very own, . . . the two are struck from their senses by love . . . These are people who finish out their lives together and still cannot say what it is they want from one another. No one would think . . . that mere erotic union [*tōn aphrodisiōn sunousia*] is the reason each lover takes so great and deep a joy in being with the other . . . The soul of every lover longs for something else . . . , [which] like an oracle . . . hides behind a riddle. (*Symposium* 192b–d)

In Hegel instead, the natural basis of love is and remains, even in its ethical transfiguration, heterosexuality. In speaking of love as the attraction of opposites, Hegel uses the word “opposition” in equivocal ways: it signifies at times the biological complementarity of female and male; at other times it refers to the logical opposition between being-one and being-other; and in still other contexts it denotes the tension between one-sidedness and wholeness. But in the *Geschlechtsverhältnis*, the opposite that an individual craves is always meant to be an individual of the opposite sex. The naturalistic telos of the relation remains paramount. Whether highest imperative or natural purpose, the continuation of the species is the chief motive-force of the attraction. Instead of the moving eloquence and the finely nuanced connotations of individuals’ eros in Plato’s *Symposium*, Hegel’s laconic treatment stands out, as will be shown presently, for the rather incongruous intrusion of notions from entirely different spheres of spirit: statehood, family, science, art, objective interests. His anthropological account of the soul’s natural diremptions and

reintegrations is suddenly and brusquely reworded in terms of their peremptory redirections in civil society: “Sexuality attains in the *family* its spiritual and ethical significance and determination” (*Enc* §397) is the austere last sentence of this briefest of sections.

All this is not to say that Hegel’s treatment of sexuality in the *Anthropology* is entirely inconsistent with Plato’s—except for the already mentioned reduction of the threefold sexual orientation down to one—nor that it is inconsistent with Hegel’s own discussion in the *Philosophy of Nature*, whose upshot is that the importance of sexual difference lies in its being a bodily difference with the potential to shape subjectivity. Given that the soul is a hylomorphic entity, sexuality naturally pertains both to its physiological and spiritual sides. The soul, we may say, is both sexed and gendered. This is why the term *Geschlechtsverhältnis* best characterizes the subject matter: while the English term “sexuality” suggests a fixed feature of individuals, Hegel’s term signifies a relation (*Verhältnis*), namely a particular inward relation to self that produces a particular relation to others. As is the case in Aristophanes’s speech, eros arises from a felt absence and consists of an urge to fill this void—to find one’s missing half. In this, Hegel follows Plato almost to the letter. This is, however, the only hint we are given of Hegel’s acknowledging the complexity and refinement of Plato’s eros.

One could, of course, interpret Hegel’s neglect of the rich implications of the *Symposium* as a simple case of misinterpretation or as excessive Victorian reserve, but two circumstances speak against this. Both pertain to the history of the *Symposium*’s reception. First, one finds adaptations of Aristophanes’s speech to Renaissance sensibilities already in Ficino’s *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis De Amore*, completed in 1469.³¹ Among other things, as pointed out by Höslé (2006), in Ficino’s commentary the “bodies” of Aristophanes’s speech become “souls,” and Zeus’s punishment of the original human *genos* is turned into the pagan analogue of the biblical punishment of the original sinners. While we know that Hegel owned Ficino’s Latin translations and commentaries, and might have well preferred to treat eros in public lectures through Ficino’s lens, he was of course also thoroughly acquainted with the Greek sources. Second, Hegel’s brief comment on Platonic love in the *Philosophy of Right*, a comment firmly embedded in the discussion of the modern, heterosexual family, shows him to be fully aware of the historical misrepresentations (“so-called *Platonic* love”) of ancient thoughts and attitudes on this matter:

It is a further abstraction when the divine, the substantial, has been separated from its being [*Dasein*], thereby also stamping sensuousness and the consciousness of spiritual unity as falsely so-called *Platonic love*; this separation is linked with the monkish viewpoint according to which the moment of physical life is determined as the absolutely *negative* . . . (*RPh* §163 Anm)

Whatever the explanation of Hegel's reserve in the *Anthropology*, the clumsy syntax and the hurried treatment of sexuality in the remainder of §397 lend themselves to the interpretation that he is directly connecting biological sex and the subjectivity that comes along with it—the gendering of sex—with interests and activities that have little to do with nature and everything with status and power in civil society. The sexual condition is in the end determined to be a relation between two poles, one characterized by subjective interests and the life of feeling, the other by objective interests and the *vita activa* that necessarily accompanies them:

Sexuality [is] a natural difference, on the one hand, of subjectivity that remains in agreement with itself in ethical sensibility, love and so on, without progressing to the extreme of having universal ends, [such as those of] state, science, art, etcetera; *on the other hand*, [it is a difference] of the kind of activity that tenses itself in itself to become the opposition of universal objective interests against the present existence, whether its own or external mundane existence, and realizes the former in the latter in a newly produced unity. Sexuality attains in the *family* its spiritual and ethical meaning and determination. (*Enc* §397)

This is a linguistically graceless reformulation of the explication, given in the *Philosophy of Right*, of the passive and active aspects of the sexual relation, and of their felicitous union in the modern family. If anything, the terms of this grounding in the political treatise are even more naturalistic than those in the *Anthropology*:

The difference of man and woman is that of animal and plant: the animal corresponds more to the man's character; the plant more to the woman's, because hers is a quieter unfolding whose principle is the more undefined unity of sentence. (*RPh* §166 Zus)³²

In the *Anthropology*, it is safe to say, Hegel makes no use whatsoever of the rich possibilities offered by a classically inspired theory of the sexual differentiations of the soul. In addition, it is perhaps not a trivial fact that the chapter on the "Philosophy of Plato" in the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* contains no reference to the *Symposium*. Instead, Hegel discusses this dialogue in the lecture on the "Philosophy of Socrates," where he treats it exclusively as exhibiting Plato's display of Socratic virtue. Love is not mentioned once in this lecture. The last sentence of the *Anthropology*'s §397 (quoted above) directly refers Hegel's audience and readership to the juridical and ethical treatment of the subject matter in the *Philosophy of Right*. If we follow this lead to the discussion on "family" as the most natural sphere of existence of ethical life, and in particular, on the family's grounding in

individuals' love as acknowledged in marriage (*RPh* §§161–68), we find a compelling depiction of the logic of the modern bourgeois family, but not a trace of the complexities of ancient eros. The only erotic longing Hegel seems to acknowledge in these pages is of those whose joining together has the power to produce a new generation tasked with carrying on the civil condition. Gone is the divinity of *erōs*, “the best friend of humans, the helper and the healer of the ills which are the great impediment to the happiness of the race” (*Symposium* 189c–d); gone also is “the amazement of love and friendship and intimacy” that prompts people in various sexual combinations to “pass their whole lives together”; and even the oracular quality of mutual desire whose cause “hides behind a riddle” is forgotten (*Symposium* 192b–d, quoted above). For Hegel, the object of erotic desire in the civil condition is pretty straightforward. It does not differ significantly from the biological telos of the species. Hence, for Hegel the attachment of partners is, in natural as much as in ethical respects, heterosexual.

To his credit, Hegel is quite insistent in the *Philosophy of Right* that the (modern) family is not founded on the necessity to curb the sexual urge or its exercise. Nor is it founded on a contract³³ or its alleged antipode, the erotic feeling that saturates the sentimental literature of the time. Friedrich von Schlegel's early Romantic work *Lucinde* was first published in 1800. By 1830 (the year of the *Encyclopaedia*'s last edition) the Romantic school had been weakened by political reactions and overshadowed by Goethe's ultimately undisputed preeminence in the world of German letters. But long before the third and last edition of the *Encyclopaedia*, namely, in the *Philosophy of Right* (1820), Hegel has already made explicit his scorn for Schlegel's brand of Romanticism: Schlegel's argument against marriage as the destroyer of authentic free love is “an argument not unknown to seducers” (*RPh* §164 Zus). Among Hegel's younger contemporaries, Heinrich Heine, in his *History of Modern Belles Lettres in Germany* (1833), best summarizes the decline of the Romantic movement at the peak of Goethe's fame, as well as Hegel's own disdain for certain representatives of the movement:

[Goethe's] voice obliterated the whole spook; the ghosts of the Middle Ages fled; the owls crept back into their obscure castle ruins; the crows flapped again toward their old church towers; Friedrich Schlegel moved to Vienna, where he attended daily Mass and ate roast cockerels; Mister August Wilhelm Schlegel withdrew in the pagoda of the Brahma. (Heine 1833)

Hegel insists that the family (or rather marriage, family's founding act) is based on mutual “juridically ethical love [*rechtlich sittliche Liebe*]” (*RPh* §161 Zus). This must include both subjective and objective elements: the “subjective inclination” of both individuals toward one another (which may still include “parental provisions,” when advantageous), and the individuals'

“objective free consent” (*RPh* §162). Yet the division of roles in this ethical institution closely follows the division of functions in reproduction: biological necessity is unceremoniously and undialectically elevated to playing a pivotal role in the shaping of ethical life. As we noted earlier with regard to the alleged connection between the geological features of continents and the psychological dispositions of their native peoples (*Enc* §393 *Zus*), even in the *Philosophy of Right* the transformation of natural into spiritual realities is described in terse but also hasty formulations like the following: “Marriage . . . implies, *first*, the moment of *natural* vitality, namely . . . the reality of the *species* and its process . . . *Secondly*, . . . in self-consciousness the unity of the natural sexes . . . becomes transformed in spiritual, self-conscious love” (*RPh* §161). The reason why Hegel presents this transition from nature to spirit as an almost effortless one is that the physical and spiritual differences between the sexes are—he says—equally rational: they are rational in view of nature’s aims as well as in view of spirit’s ends. Hence, the natural basis of such differences need not be radically overcome by spirit. It is just being imported and transfigured in it: “The *natural* determinacy of both sexes acquires by virtue of its rationality *intellectual* and *ethical* meaning” (*RPh* §165).

Even if Hegel judged that the erotic experience and sexual conceptions of any given civilization, being a subject of study for historians or cultural anthropologists, carry no particular philosophical relevance, still it is surprising that he would so plainly reduce natural and spiritual sexuality to one type—especially in view of his wide-ranging and deep familiarity with Greek and Roman literature, with Far Eastern and African thought and artworks, with world history and the history of the figurative arts. Despite his emphasis on sexuality as an activity rather than a fixed attribute, for Hegel this dynamic relation is primarily a relating of the individual to the biological species, not a relating of one’s incompleteness to one’s full realization. Individuals in Hegel’s *Geschlechtsverhältnis* remain curiously unaffected by their other. One pole in the relation is typified as pursuing particularity (“ethical sensibility, love and so on”); the other, as pursuing universal interests (“state, science, art”). They come together precisely because their pursuits do not overlap. The basis of the modern family is a unity in which opposites do not mix. Unlike in Aristotle’s household, their bond is love, but just as in Aristotle’s household, they coexist for mutual advantage.

The idea of erotic longing as a “seeking and finding” of one’s full self in another, even when un-Platonically and unnecessarily restricted to heterosexual longing, would seem to imply an important feature of the anthropological soul, an implication that Hegel does not draw. According to this idea, erotic desire for the other sex signals the lingering presence of this otherness in the desiring subject. One does not long for what one is not already familiar with, even if just at the level of indistinct and inarticulate inward perception. What I have no affinity with arouses at best my curiosity, not my longing.

The story from the *Symposium* makes this abundantly clear. Heterosexuality is the destiny of individuals in whom remain the vestiges of androgynism; homosexuality is the destiny of those in whom linger the remnants of same-sex double beings. Rather than expanding on the rational implications of Aristophanes's myth of origins on behalf of a complexified conception of the natural and cultural dimensions of human love—eros in first and second nature, as it were—Hegel's laconic finding is, first, that social functions naturally match sexual specializations (one tends to heart and hearth, and the other to politics, science, and artistic endeavors); and second, that sexuality is best addressed in a subaltern social institution that allows nature to play itself out.

The third self-induced type of alteration of the soul (a. β 3: *Enc* §398) pertains to the cyclic and oscillatory movements that characterize live matter. Hegel focuses mostly on the alternation between the sleeping and waking states of organisms. He considers these patterns of living matter to be key for the emergence of sentience in animals. This momentous alteration of the soul deserves to be treated in a separate chapter, which follows.

Chapter 6



Premonitions of Selfhood, or *die ahnende Seele*

God has given the art of divination
not to the wisdom, but to the
madness of man

—Plato, *Timaueus*

1. Organic Sensibility and Psyche's Sentience

Hegel positions the natural activity of sentience (*Empfindung*) as the successor of sensibility (*Sensibilität*) and the predecessor of feeling (*Gefühl*).¹ This systematic ordering is best understood against the background of the metaphysical thesis, discussed above in chapter 2, that just as the truth of material nature is its immateriality—"Spirit is the existing truth of matter, that matter itself has no truth" (*Enc* §389 Anm)—so the truth of the living body is spirit. Having "no truth" is of course not tantamount to having no existence. The whole phenomenal world is for Hegel an existent that, taken as such, that is, in abstraction from its essence, has "no truth." It does not follow that the phenomenal world does not exist. What that fundamental formulation at the beginning of the *Anthropology* means is that every existent is in a state of untruth as long as its potentiality is not fully actualized. With regard to the *Anthropology*'s subject matter, this implies that before the emergence of forms of spirit, of which the soul is but the first, physical nature holds in itself an as yet unrealized potential. The soul arises from nature as the realization of a potentiality that nature has harbored all along.² This general and, to this extent, abstract conception of truth and untruth underlies all of Hegel's accounts of actuality as a development through phases or "moments." With regard to nature, for example, this conception implies that the truth of mechanism (nature's mechanical organization) is chemism (the chemical organization of nature), and that the truth of chemism is in turn nature's organicity. The same holds with regard to the major moments of spirit: conscious being is the truth of the feeling soul, the feeling soul of the sentient, and so on all the way back to merely reactive, organic being.

A further presupposition to be borne in mind for a full grasp of Hegel's unusual conception of sentience consists of a principle, widely shared among nineteenth-century scientists of the then-burgeoning discipline of biology, according to which the branching-out of varieties inside a larger taxon (phylogenesis) and the development of individuals' standard embryonic formation (ontogenesis) follow the same patterns.³ This postulate is reflected in Hegel's choice of examples in the Remarks and Additions to §§399–402, examples that are meant to illustrate parallels between the world-soul's and the individual soul's respective processes of sublation of their preceding states. In the context of this discussion, Hegel takes for granted that corporeity is as much a necessary presupposition of organic processes as of spiritual ones, even as he focuses increasingly on the latter: these are functions and activities of what is aptly (if paradoxically) called "natural spirit." As shown in chapter 1, with regard to the ontology of living matter, the principle of the essential immateriality of matter implies the jointly double (*zwiefach*), natural and spiritual, status of the soul.

In the following, I reconstruct Hegel's elaborate argument by which this peculiar ontological status of the soul helps explain how and why forms of life transition from passive physiological sensibility to active sentience and eventually to feeling. The argument employs the concept of physical nature's *self*-sublation into living organicity, a dynamic by which physical nature is said by Hegel to both overcome and preserve itself. The movement is said to continue in the form of the soul's progressive self-distinguishing and increasing independence from its corporeal dimension—a self-differentiation in the living that, however, never becomes a separation. Keeping in mind the dynamic nature of all subject matter in Hegel's philosophy of the real (nature is a realm of active relations; the soul is organic nature's drive to overcome itself; and spirit is a process of actualization of the Idea), the soul is best grasped, as previously indicated, as straddling the provinces of what are commonly but reductively conceived as plain nature on the one hand, and pure spirit on the other. Although Hegel's notion of the amphibious status of the soul is admittedly unusual and far from incontrovertible, it ought to, at the very least, not be misunderstood as implying a "third" ontological domain beyond or alongside nature and spirit: the soul simply shares in both.

This twin status of natural spirit goes a long way toward elucidating Hegel's explications of some observable empirical manifestations of individual human souls, such as the life of the fetus, human derangement, psychosomatic illness, collective hysteria, and somnambulist and hypnotic states. As already mentioned, Hegel's term *Beseeltes* (the ensouled), which he uses repeatedly in the *Philosophy of Spirit*⁴ in acknowledgment of the Aristotelian *empsychon* (a term found throughout *De anima*), refers to the living individual in which or in whom materiality and ideality are united as one. This unity—Hegel's *Einheit* is Aristotle's *sunolon*—denotes a complete substance; that is, a corporeal existent thoroughly determined by an

eidetic, noncorporeal principle. In chapter 1 we have seen that Hegel expands the Aristotelian conception of the emotions (from *De anima's* first book) as physical events that happen *in* but carry meaning *for* the individual (as *logoi enhuloi*) to include their ground, *hupokeimenon*, or subject, as one whole. For Hegel, it is not just the emotions and affections of the subject, but the whole living subject that is an identity of *eidos* and *hule*. Hence, his full account of the soul naturally comprises its somatic as well as its subjective foundation and manifestations.

Against this theoretical background, it is easy to see why for Hegel the ascription of sentience either to body or to mind amounts to a false disjunction. Indeed, as the 1807 *Phenomenology* already argues, reflection shows that the concept of a pure sensing implies that simple sensation affects a natural individual only insofar as the latter does not distinguish inner from outer reality, because this distinction itself cannot be sensed. For the merely sentient subject, sense-impressions are the whole of what there is. The individual is what it senses, and so is its world: individual and world coincide in so-called simple sentience. A first tentative differentiation of interiority from exteriority emerges for the individual only in the phase of feeling. It finally becomes a clear distinction with the onset of consciousness, the phase of the soul's "abstract thought of its 'I,' of its unending being-for-self" (*Enc* §400 Zus).⁵

Due to the nonmediated character of sentience, its discussion begins already in the *Philosophy of Nature*. The metaphysical underpinnings of this conception are spelled out in the introductory paragraph to this treatise as follows:

Nature is *in itself* a living whole; the movement [of nature] through its series of stages further consists of this, that the Idea *posits* itself as what it is *in-itself*; or, in other words, that the Idea moves *inwardly* out of its immediacy and externality, which is *death*, so as to be, first, *living being*; but further, [the movement consists of the Idea's] sublating even this determinacy, in which it is only life, and generating itself as the existence of spirit, which is the truth and final end of nature and the true actuality of the Idea.⁶ (*PhN Enc* §251)

In this paragraph, "nature" and "the Idea" are used interchangeably. Both denote a real movement of being from lifelessness to life to spiritual activity. Nature's movement is here at once the movement of the Idea: a necessary sequence in natural developments is nothing but the progressive exposure of the intrinsic logic of the Idea. Both therefore issue in the same result: the final end of nature is the fully actualized Idea.

In the greater *Science of Logic* (section 3: "The Idea"), Hegel defines the Idea as the unconditioned or absolute union of objectivity and its concept, a union that deserves the designation "the *true as such*" (*WdL W* 6:462). The

referent of the Hegelian notion of “the true”—not to be confounded with cognitive or propositional “truth”—is neither a logically and ontologically obscure correspondence between *rei et intellectus* (thing and intellect), nor an inexplicable contact boundary between the concept of an object and its referent; nor can a conceptless object or an objectless concept qualify as “true,” in view of Kant’s disclosure of the notion of the thing-in-itself as a “problematic concept.” Hence, by speaking of “the true,” Hegel refers to a genuine and real union of concept and object. The true does not consist of a harmony, coincidence, similarity, or commensurability of concept and object, but is the realization of the concept: “The Idea is the *adequate concept*, the objectively true, or the *true as such*. If anything has truth, it has it by virtue of its idea, or *something has truth only insofar as it is idea*” (WdL W 6:462).

Bearing this in mind, we may reconstruct the just-quoted passage from the *Philosophy of Nature* in the following way. First, although life is implicit in nonliving nature (insofar as it belongs to the *concept* of nature), the mere being-there or *Dasein* of nature is abstract being or simple exteriority. Second, since this exteriority is an incomplete way in which the Idea or “the *true as such*” exists, what is purely exterior must necessarily undergo further developments in order to overcome this lopsided mode of existence: if the concept of the Idea contains more than the reciprocal exteriority of what constitutes this *Dasein*, this existence will have to develop accordingly. This means, third, that nature must develop itself by sublating its own exteriority. But the sublation of exteriority can only be achieved through a movement of interiorization. Hence, fourth, in the course of this overcoming of exteriority, new realities (new modes of existence of the Idea) emerge—realities with which we are, as a matter of fact, quite familiar: phenomena of natural life and activities of spirit. Fifth and last: it follows from this process of internalization of the real that psychological, mental, and spiritual phenomena are powers implicit in nature and thus are logical antecedents of their phenomenal appearance in nature. In this metaphysical scheme, the realization of nature’s intrinsic powers is precisely that unity of outwardness and inwardness which defines actuality Idea, namely, the actual or *die Wirklichkeit*.

This dense account of the metaphysical presuppositions of sentient natural bodies requires some further analysis. First, to speak of nature’s exteriority is neither a tautological pronouncement about the fact that spatial objects are reciprocally external, nor an equally trivial declaration that objects subsist outside the domain of subjectivity. The characterization of nature as the realm of exteriority refers instead to the *self-external* character of being-there, *Dasein*. By using “self-externality,” Hegel draws attention to a pivotal negative feature of nonliving bodies: the absence of a centripetal conveyance of externally generated impressions toward a center. This is the reason why inorganic bodies are properly called composites and compounds, but never genuine or organic units. Among other things, this self-externality explains why inanimate bodies eventually disintegrate, but do not die.

The inward relatedness of organisms is the reverse of the reciprocally external relatedness of inorganic bodies. Hegel repeatedly refers to organic inwardness with expressions like “natural subjectivity” (not a state but a process of internalization) and even “the conceptuality” of nature. With implicit references to Aristotle (in particular, to the latter’s discussion of the continuity and discreteness of matter, space, and time in *Physics* VI, and to his employment of anatomical references in *Metaphysics* Z 11), Hegel summarizes the logical distinction between self-externality and inwardness in the following way:

The infinite divisibility of matter means . . . that matter is something external to itself . . . Absence of conceptuality [*Begrifflosigkeit*] predominates in nature . . . It is only in life that subjectivity emerges, the opposite of exteriority [*Aussereinander*]; heart, liver, eye are no . . . individuals, and the hand severed from the body rots.⁷ (*PhN Enc* §248 Zus)

A further metaphysical presupposition of the account of sentience and feeling has been briefly discussed in chapter 2. The Hegelian thesis that originally self-external nature overcomes and preserves itself in producing living and spiritual entities is not equivalent to the thesis that nature becomes sublated by one other than itself. Rather, it means that nature overcomes its exteriority by its own powers. We have seen how the first section of the *Anthropology* (§388) spells this out: spirit, understood as comprising subjective activities, objective historical deeds, and absolute manifestations, originates in this self-sublation of still “untrue” nature, a process in which abstract existence⁸ gives way to the increasingly concrete reality of various forms of spirit.⁹

We have followed Hegel’s analysis of the fundamental qualities (α) and changes (β) of natural individuals. We are now being introduced to the key capacity (γ) of individuals to maintain sameness and to thrive throughout qualitative differentiations and unrelenting change. This is the faculty of sentience. It is a capacity to receive and detect multiple impressions as if they belonged to one whole, a center entirely unknown to the sentient individual itself. Animal sentience is not a capacity to select or posit sensations, but only a capacity to discover them. Calling the virtual place of this detection “inwardness” is, of course, only meaningful from a subsequent perspective of psychic development, namely consciousness. By itself, the sentient soul must be entirely unaware of the “inner-outer” distinction. For Hegel, sentience is fully defined as a simple detecting of sensations: *Empfindung* is inner finding.

Hegel’s account is not free of obscurities.¹⁰ While his phenomenological description of this paradoxical activity of finding what is already present is compelling, his argument for explaining the emergence of this capacity in the living individual is less than terse. He claims that sentience arises from the cycle of passivity and activity, of latency and expression, or of the Aristotelian

“sleeping” and “waking” exhibited by living nature. Yet the explanation of sentience as resulting from these natural fluctuations of living entities must be supplemented (at a minimum) with a thesis that Hegel does not make explicit. This is the thesis of an intrinsic imbalance between activity and dormancy, so that sentience results from the superior power and broader reach of the active over the passive states of living individuals. The following reconstruction aims at making explicit this presupposition and its function in Hegel’s account of the emergence of sentience.

We cannot understand sentience in terms of a simple receptivity for stimuli. Sentience proper, while dependent on the simply receptive sensibility that bears the name of *Sensibilität* in the *Philosophy of Nature*, enables the individual to distinguish (*unterscheiden*) itself as one, that is, as a whole of relations, from itself as many, that is, as multiple *relata* in that whole (*Verschiedenheit*). This is why sentience may be viewed as the birthplace of all relations to the self. One must note that already at the most primitive stages of life’s development identity predominates over difference, because the preservation of the living individual requires self-sameness to prevail over self-differentiation—or “identity” over “difference.” In the crisp if abstract conceptuality of Plato’s *Parmenides*, one may say that it is not the Many that differentiates between the One and the Many; it is the One that does the differentiating.

Hegel highlights a parallelism between, on the one hand, the opposition between self-sameness and self-differentiation in the individual, and, on the other, the opposition between the physiological states of sleeping and waking. He also refers to sleeping and waking as, respectively, the undifferentiated being in-itself and the differentiated being for-itself of the individual soul. The parallelism is meant to be more than a convenient analogy. Rather, Hegel conceives living nature’s cycles of dormancy and activity to be the principal real conditions for sentience to emerge in nature. We must therefore examine more closely the account of this natural rhythm in the final section of “Natural changes” (*Enc* §398, *Anm* and *Zus*), as well as in the opening section dedicated to sentience itself (*Enc* §399). Already this systematic positioning of the discussion of the sleep-waking cycle suggests that Hegel views it as key to unlocking the enigma of sentience.

Taking his cue from the second book of *De anima*: “Both sleep and waking imply the presence of soul; and while waking corresponds to the exercise of knowledge, sleep is analogous to its possession without its exercise” (*Da* II.1 412a22–26), Hegel emphasizes that the fundamental difference between the sleeping and waking conditions is not a difference of the soul’s contents but a difference of the soul’s *relation to* its contents. In sleep, the soul is immediately related to its own contents or “determinacies.” Sleep is a condition in which the psyche dispenses with mediums like active memory, attention, and even imagination. Calling “sleep” a state of indistinctness is only legitimate insofar as in this state no distinction is made between the individual’s

oneness and its multiplicity. Sunk in each of its affections, the sleeping soul is utterly “undifferentiated”; it is a universality merely in-itself (*Enc* §398). When awake, by contrast, the soul relates to its inner manifold as to a totality: it identifies this manifold as its own content. Waking from sleep is a physiological coming home to one’s fuller self.

To prevent misunderstandings, it must be emphasized that for Hegel waking (*wachen*) and becoming awake (*erwachen*), despite being related to *Bewusstsein* and *Bewusstwerden*, that is, to being and becoming conscious of objectivity as otherness, as well as to *Gewahrsein* and *Gewahrwerden*, that is, to being and becoming aware of one’s surroundings, are coincident with neither. Epistemic consciousness and its psychological counterpart, awareness, are defined primarily in relation to externality. Not so the waking state of the soul. In the theoretical framework of the *Anthropology*, sleep is the equivalent of latency or potentiality—as in the metaphysical-biological context of *De anima*’s uses of “sleep”; awakening is closest to the “tremendous leap” (*Enc* §396 Zus) of birth in contrast to fetal life; and the waking state amounts to the Aristotelian “exercise” of knowledge already in one’s possession—not to any radically new type of cognition.¹¹

If the surfacing of sentience in natural life forms must be explained by their alternating between active and inactive states, one must also presuppose an imbalance between these two, lest they be permanently caught in a simple cycle, incapable of advancement. Indeed, Hegel highlights that the alternation is only superficially a simple case of “badly” infinite repetition, a back-and-forth motion without resolution. In reality, there is an essential teleological difference between the two states: while waking is the end of sleeping, sleeping is not the end of waking. The latter has ends of its own. Whether understood in physiological or metaphysical terms, the sleeping soul is a repository of contents from which the waking soul draws in order to fulfill further and more complex aims.

Again following an Aristotelian template, according to which the spontaneous alterations of living substances are “metabolic” changes from potency to actuality (*Da* II.1, 412a19–21), Hegel describes the asymmetry in the natural rhythm of living individuals as follows:

Sleeping and waking are . . . not mere alterations but *alternating* conditions. In this formal, negative relation of theirs, there is, however, also contained an *affirmative* one. In . . . being for self . . . the waking soul *finds within itself*, and that is, for itself, . . . the inward determinacies of its sleeping nature . . . Insofar as spirit remains captured in the bonds of naturalness, this return [of the soul from one to the other state] represents nothing but the empty *repetition* of the beginning—a tedious cycle. However, taken in itself or according to its concept [*dem Begriffe nach*], there is [in this return] at the same time an *advance*. (*Enc* §399 and Zus)

Thanks to its concept, that is, to the intrinsic end of its development,¹² and regardless of the monotonous appearance of the cycle, the waking soul reaches beyond its own dormant state. In the sleeping condition, the soul is only a passive storehouse of contents; in the waking condition, it actively accesses those contents within itself. The sleeping state is the potential for waking, but being awake is the potential for further states. For example, while the psyche of the fetus is a dormant repository of impressions shared with the mother's psyche, the "tremendous leap" of birth is an irrevocable awakening from this dormancy. In postfetal life, there is no relapsing into our primal sleep: the slumber to which we daily revert bears only a faint resemblance to our unborn life.

The sleep-waking rhythm of the animal is connected but not reducible to the analogous patterns of vegetative life. Plants' daily and seasonal patterns are equally alternations between opposite states—for example, the daily absorption and nightly emission of carbon dioxide or, in the yearly cycle, the frenzied reproductive activity of spring which follows winter's near death and reverts to the latter again in the end. But the rhythm of animal life is characterized by the engendering of a new activity:

The transition [from one to the other] has *for us* . . . the result that the undifferentiated substantial being of the soul in sleep, as well as its . . . still empty being-for-self in waking, prove . . . to be . . . one-sided and untrue determinations, thus enabling their concrete unity to emerge as their *truth*. . . This unity . . . attains *actuality* . . . in the *sentient* soul. (*Enc* §399 Zus)

At the animal and human level, the waking soul is no longer only submerged in each sensation that affects it; rather, it collects all sensations in its incipient selfness. The waking soul is as it were a sensing of sensed impressions, or sentience on the verge of feeling. This differentiation of a mere sensing from a sensing of sensing may be understood as a doubling of the soul. In itself the individual is still plant-like but in that doubling it is also on its way to becoming, for-itself, animal-like. To take possession of found sensations is to exceed one's in-itselfness. To use Leibnizian tropes, it is this excess that opens a window in the hitherto merely living monad.¹³ Yet this is not a window that opens outwardly, but inwardly. A new reality is born from this process: the inwardness of animal life.

Of course, the collecting of multiple sensations into oneness differs vastly from the unifying act by which the "I" constitutes objects in experience. It also differs from conscious reflection on the contents of one's mind. There is neither "I" nor consciousness in this phase of spirit's development. The activity of gathering impressions is limited to forming an inchoate *Erleben*, a living through one's multiple sensations; it is not an active experiencing (*Erfahrung*) of occurrences and objects. There is in sentience a passive registering of

sensations without additional reference to their sources, whether external or internal. The sentient soul is for Hegel a steady and accomplished weaver of received sensations into a canvas, whose design is entirely unknown to it. The sentient soul simply provides the warp and woof of selfhood.

The *Philosophy of Nature* (in particular, arguments from parts 2 and 3: “Physics” and “Organic Physics”) offers keys to Hegel’s conception of the roots of sentience in pre-sentient processes that provide the soul with the sensations it eventually finds in itself. A philosophy of nature is, of course, not the appropriate context in which to discuss genuine processes of inwardization—let alone the systematic place at which to introduce the immateriality of material nature. In this context, therefore, Hegel makes repeated use of the term “sensitivity” (*Sensibilität*) to refer to a preponderantly passive feature of organisms, while using “irritability” (*Irritabilität*) to refer to the related but distinct capacity to react to sensations.

More importantly, we find in the *Philosophy of Nature* a discussion of the ubiquitous role that motional patterns play in inorganic as much as organic nature. These patterns turn out to be pivotal in the subsequent explanation of sentience in the *Anthropology*. The *Philosophy of Nature* refers to these motions as to the quivering, pulsating, or inner vibrating of physical bodies: *das Erzittern*. Further discussions of the quivering motion are found again in the sections entitled “Life” in both the lesser and greater *Science of Logic*. In the latter, for example, having defined *Sensibilität* as “the living objectivity of the individual,” Hegel defines its distinguishing property as consisting of “the pure vibration [*Erzittern*] of vitality in-itself alone” (*WdL W* 6:478).

In the “Physics,” Hegel uses the internal quivering of inorganic bodies as the explanatory ground of the cohesion and resistance of physical masses, as well as of the related phenomena of elasticity and sound (*PhN Enc* §§295–302). In the elasticity of a physical mass, he states, “motion persists . . . not as reaction to externality but as internal reaction, until the shape [of the body] has been recovered. This is the oscillation and swinging of the body continued inwardly” (*PhN Enc* §298 Zus). The back-and-forth between forces of cohesion and repulsion also gives rise not just to a body’s vibration, but to its sound:

The ideality posited in this [oscillating pattern] is an alteration that consists of a double negation. The negating of the self-external consistency of the material parts is in turn negated as a reconstitution of their mutual externality and of their cohesion; it is *one* ideality as the changeover of reciprocally sublating determinations, the internal shaking of the body in itself—*sound* [Klang]. (*PhN Enc* §299)

Soon after this reference to inward quivering as a type of “ideality” of material bodies—an anticipation of the “immateriality of matter” familiar to readers of the *Anthropology*—Hegel argues that the immediate result of this inner

motion, namely sound, signifies “the transition of material *spatiality* to material *temporality*” (*PhN Enc* §300) in the organism. He adds the following striking comment: “With the fact that *in the vibrating* of what is corporeal [*am Materiellen*] . . . this form exists as its *ideality*, the simple form comes to *exist for itself* and appears as . . . mechanical soulfulness [*mechanische Seelenhaftigkeit*]” (*PhN Enc* §300). The mention of “mechanical soulfulness” in the “Physics” is more than a metaphor: it is meant to convey the reality of natural spirit’s rootedness in inorganic nature, even in its mechanical subsystems. Furthermore, by tracing the roots of natural sentience back to inorganic phenomena, Hegel directs attention to a basic asymmetry that is already present at this stage of the crude but “soulful” dynamics of natural mechanisms. This is the asymmetry that anticipates the imbalance characteristic of living bodies: for as long as the mechanical system remains in existence, the cohesion of its parts is the dominant force while its negation—its disintegrating, entropic force—is reactive. Only the continual negation of this negation, or the reaction to the reaction, guarantees the permanence of the mechanical system.

The internal quivering of bodies is picked up again in the “Organic Physics,” this time with reference to the self-induced internal motion of living organisms (*PhN Enc* §351). This motion assumes a pivotal explanatory role here: it turns out to be living nature’s primal means of subsistence. The principal effect of a body’s internal vibration is the elevation of its temperature vis-à-vis that of the surroundings. Heat ensures that the living being can preserve its frame (*Gestalt*) in opposition to the hostile forces that encircle it. It is precisely this primitive, purely physical capacity for self-distinction that enables the living specimen to develop “sensibility,” a physical susceptibility and eventually reaction to an environment that the specimen “experiences” (*erlebt*) as distinct from itself.

The subsequent sections of “Organic Physics” are dedicated to explicating the three basic activities of self-preserving individuality: sensibility (*Sensibilität*), irritability (*Irritabilität*), and self-replication (*Reproduktion*). The organism must be capable of all three in order to preserve its frame. In a typically “idealistic” expository reversal, Hegel goes on to deduce from these three necessary functions the fundamental types of organs found in all developed organisms. He thus presents these organs as somatic expressions of the functional meanings of “organic life.”

Sensibility is the first capacity of what is living—of the plant as much as of the “animal subject” (*PhN Enc* §353). It consists of straightforwardly somatic receptivity, a “*generic inwardness*” of the living body: the individual allows itself to be physically affected all the while remaining “undividedly identical with itself” (*PhN Enc* §353). Not only plant species and specimens, but the vegetative systems internal to animal organisms embody this somatic receptivity. Sensibility in this primitive sense can be conceptualized as a susceptibility to what is other on the part of the natural individual that is, by itself, wholly indifferent to otherness.

Irritability and replication are the second and third fundamental capacities of organic bodies. In living matter, irritability is the counterpart of the elasticity of inorganic bodies.¹⁴ As for “reproduction” (*Reproduktion*), the term does not refer here to specimens’ periodic activities of species propagation—activities to which Hegel refers in the *Anthropology*, as we have seen, as *Geschlechtsverhältnis* or, with a dry reference to a French *magnetiseur*, “the concentration of soul’s life in the nether parts” (*Enc* §406 Zus). Rather, “reproduction” here refers to self-regeneration or replication. It refers to living bodies’ continual preservation of their singular frame through the reproduction of their parts—be these organs, tissues, or cells.

In the *Encyclopaedia Logic*, under the titles “The Idea” and “Life,” we find a helpful overview of the fundamental determinations of this “inner process of the living”:

In nature, the process of the living [*des Lebendigen*] inside itself has the threefold form of sensibility, irritability, and replication. As sensibility, the living is immediate simple relation to self, the soul omnipresent in its [the soul’s] own body, whose self-externality has no truth for the soul. As irritability, the living appears dirempted in itself, and as replication it constantly regenerates itself . . . The living *exists* only as this constantly self-renewing inward process. (*L Enc* §218 Zus)

In the different but equivalent perspective of the *Philosophy of Nature*, Hegel refers to these three requisite connotations of live being as necessary facets of the “crystallization” or physical existence of the soul: “Sensibility, irritability, and replication, concretely consolidated into a complete frame [*Gestalt*], form the external configuration [*Gestaltung*] of the organism, the crystal of live being” (*PhN Enc* §355 Zus).

Hegel’s clarifications of this point (given in *PhN Enc* §353 Zus) make it obvious that he understands these basic functions as physical capacities. It is also evident that he conceives them as mutually different not just in the scientific constructions of the biologist, the anatomist, or the philosopher of nature. Rather, all organisms belonging to the “higher ranks of life” display these three distinct functions. It is only the simplest organisms that exhibit a primitive fusion of all three features into one. Based on famed studies of contractile “mucous membranes” (for example, Johann Blumenbach’s *solidum vivum*)¹⁵ considered to be the closest candidates for the “vital matter” (*Lebensmaterie*) hypothesized by life scientists, Hegel highlights the fact that the most primitive life forms do not manifest sensibility or irritability, as these are still entirely subsidiary to the singular activity of self-regeneration: “Hence there are animals that are nothing but replication—a frameless jelly, an active slime reflected in itself, where sensibility and irritability are not yet separate” (*PhN Enc* §353 Anm).

Empfindung (sentience) is mentioned for the first time in the “Organic Physics” as resulting from the individual’s capacity for irritability. The “motion” of sentience, Hegel adds, is the inward counterpart of the self-induced outward motion of living beings:

Accordingly, the system of *sensibility* determines itself ($\alpha\alpha$) as . . . *abstract* relation of sensibility to itself, and hereby . . . as inorganic being and absence of sensitivity [*Empfindungslosigkeit*]*—the skeletal system* . . . ; ($\beta\beta$) as the moment of *irritability*, [i.e.,] the brain system and its further ramifications in the nerves, which are inwardly the nerves of sentience [*Empfindung*], as much as outwardly the nerves of motion; ($\gamma\gamma$) as the system of *replication*, [i.e.,] the sympathetic nerve with the ganglia, in which dwells only a dull, indeterminate and will-less feeling of self. (*PhN Enc* §354).

If we wish to understand the initially “indeterminate and will-less” stages of the formation of life forms as the beginning of subjectivity in natural substances, we must think of sensations as occurrences over which the soul has no control. As sensations, these affections happen *in* but not yet *for* the soul. At this stage, the individual is not yet intrinsically divided or “dirempted”, which is the only condition under which it would be able to distinguish itself as a whole (*eine Totalität*) from the multiple and singular contents of its sensing. Only at higher levels of organic development do these immediate affections become sensations “owned” by the organism—in Hegel’s terminology, they become the soul’s ideal posits: “The at first ideally posited particularity comes into its own in irritability” and “the moment of difference in sensibility is the outward-oriented . . . *nerve system*: [it is] sentience as determinate sentience—as externally posited sensing or as self-determinacy” (*PhN Enc* §353 Zus and §354 Zus).

The intimate bond and the specific difference between *Sensibilität* as immediate affectedness, and *Empfindung* as mediated sentience, parallels the bond and the difference between sleep and the waking state: waking is an act of positing and taking possession of the contents present in sleep, just as sentience is an act of positing and taking possession of the sensations found in sensibility.

Given the universal character of patterns of oscillation between the active and inactive states of living nature, it seems at first that no qualitative novelty could result from such ever-repeating cycles. Sentience, however, does introduce a novel relation of the soul to itself. It does so by transforming—to stay with the geometric metaphor—the cycle into a spiral. Sentience is no longer the mere counterpart of being awake but rather a “higher” unification of both poles of the oscillation: if the animal organism becomes capable of proper sentience, this is because it sublates its passive and active states into a new function.

Hegel elucidates the dynamics of the soul's passive and active states in logical terms. Awakening is the soul's first inward act of judgment or division (*Urteil*) (*Enc* §398). In this diremption, the waking and the sleeping states are like the premises of a syllogism, whose conclusion (*Schluss*) ties them together by overcoming the artificial isolation (the "one-sidedness") of each (*Enc* §400 Zus). As in the abstract realm of syllogistic logic, so also in this real syllogism of nature the premises share a middle term. This is the whole of sensations found in both extremes of the soul's alternating movement. By unifying the sensations into a totality, the soul effectively brings together the poles of this movement, and what was a merely living organism passes over into animal subjectivity. No longer just imprintable, the soul is now actually sentient.

The notion of a "syllogism of sentience" also helps distinguish the spontaneous dynamics of crystals (for example, their regenerative capacity) from the activity of primitive organisms—an important distinction in view of crystals' striking affinity with primitive living things. In an 1822 fragment on "Philosophy of Spirit" (GW 15:234;¹⁶ Hegel 1978, trans. Petry, 1:123),¹⁷ Hegel also illustrates the self-dirempting and self-unifying activity of organic bodies by contrasting these with physical bodies like water: while water is affected by a coloring agent, it does not sense this change because it lacks the necessary inner diremption.

In the *Anthropology*, the diremption that breeds sentience in the living is succinctly described in the following way:

What the sentient soul finds in itself is, on the one hand, what is naturally immediate, rendered ideal in it and made into its possession. On the other hand, and *vice versa*, what originally belongs to the for-itself, namely what, once deepened in itself, is the "I" of consciousness and free spirit, becomes determined as natural *corporeity* [*zur natürlichen Leiblichkeit bestimmt*] and is sensed as such. (*Enc* §401)

We have here a precise determination of the twofold and self-oppositional nature of the sentient soul, namely, its active idealization of physical occurrences and, conversely, its sensing of itself as a physical body. This is key to all subsequent accounts of the psyche's development. Through sentience, the individual sublates or "idealizes" physical affections and becomes their subjective vessel. This is a natural subject for whom, for example, visual impressions become an object seen or acoustic impressions become a sound heard. Vice versa, subjective emotions trigger objective bodily motions: fear quickens the heart, trust relaxes the muscles. Sentience is the performative proof, as it were, that in animal subjects physicality and spirit exist in "healthy symbiosis" (*Enc* §401 Anm).

This same symbiotic relation is the necessary condition for the second-order sensations of pain and pleasure, but a study of the empirical manifestations of this symbiosis is beyond the scope of a philosophical account. Hegel only

highlights the need for, but does not provide a scientific exploration of the sympathy of body and spirit in what is living: “the *system* of internal sentience in its self-embodying particularization would be worth carrying out and treating in a specialized science, a *psychical physiology*” (*Enc* §401 Anm). Philosophy may only deduce the double character of sentience—inwardization and expression—from living nature’s hylomorphism. Following the lead of ancient philosophy’s locating of anger or courage “in the breast,” hence uniting physicalistic and dialectical accounts of emotions in the eccentric notion of en-mattered thoughts (*logoi enuloi*),¹⁸ modern philosophy explicates the animal and, above all, the human body as a becoming-corporeal of psychical conditions: “In all embodiments [*Verleiblichungen*] of the spiritual so far considered, what occurs is only the exteriorization [*Äusserlichwerden*] of soul’s motions that is necessary for the soul to be sensed . . . This kind of externalizing embodiment is shown in *laughing*, and even more in *weeping*” (*Enc* §401 Zus). The symbiosis of spirituality and materiality in the living individual, theoretically deduced from the hylomorphic concept of the soul, is empirically attested by what the nineteenth century had begun to call, borrowing from the just-emerging vocabulary of cell biology, relations of “osmosis”: just as physical afflictions are received in the soul, spiritual turmoil is relieved or even “eliminated” by acquiring bodily existence. In a statement that forecasts Freudian accounts of the somatization of psychic emotions, Hegel writes: “Yet that becoming external finds its completion only by turning into *relinquishment* [*Entäusserung*], an elimination of inward sensations” (*Enc* §401 Zus).

2. From Sentience to Self-Feeling: A Matrix for the Ego

At the closing of the analysis of sentience, Hegel offers a useful synopsis of this moment of the soul: its relation to itself is a finding of sensations in an indistinct and diffuse place that we may call, but only from the evolved perspective of conscious reflection, “self-like.” These summary remarks provide an advance insight into the next moment of natural spirit: the feeling and self-feeling soul.¹⁹

Before delving into the specifics of the analysis of feeling, a question is likely to turn up; namely, why the sentient soul must be thought of as *necessarily* transitioning into the next, more complex configuration of “feeling.” From an empirical standpoint—a standpoint, we recall, that is supposed to be the corroborating “touchstone” of any conceptual analysis worth the name of philosophy—plenty of organisms and their species appear to thrive on a wholly passive, either just sensible or even sentient symbiosis with their environs, never rising, let alone experiencing the need to rise, to anything resembling feeling or self-feeling. To address this entirely legitimate question, we must once again call upon the metaphysical foundations of Hegel’s

analysis. The following few paragraphs address, however incompletely, this larger metaphysical background.

Like all key systematic transitions pertaining to nature and spirit, even the transition from sentience to feeling is conceived by Hegel as a logically necessary one. In the specific context at issue here, this means that the progress from sentience to feeling is a connotation of life's concept. "Life" (or "live matter") denotes nothing if not nature's potentiality for self-motion, self-preservation, sentience, and feeling. But not all potentialities must be realized in every actualization of the concept—here, in every system of living nature. Mechanical and chemical systems exist alongside organic ones; only the latter are realizations of the concept of life, and only some among these actualize all the connotations contained in that concept. We should recall that, like all modes of being, even being-soul is actually a becoming, and every becoming consists of the actualization of potentialities contained in the antecedent mode of being. The meaning of "being" can be shown to be that of being-in-transition: *im Begriff sein*. It helps to bear in mind that in its common (nonphilosophical) acceptance, this German phrase means "being-about-to" or "being-in-the-process-of." The philosophical use Hegel makes of this locution specifies the end toward which being as such must tend: the completion of its concept. When this logical-metaphysical paradigm is applied to the phenomena of life, it becomes clear why Hegel considers being-soul as a becoming whose stages are vectors or moments of life. Sensibility, sentience, and feeling are segments in the full realization of life's concept. This completion even entails the real emergence of conscious being: *Bewusstsein* is after all *bewusstes Sein*. As we are told in the *Encyclopaedia Logic*, from the most rudimentary forms of self-motion to the most sophisticated activities of the will and intelligence, life forms instantiate the same dynamics by which the whole cosmos must be grasped as "the realized Concept" (*L Enc* §242). As per the famous formulation that concludes the *Encyclopaedia Logic* and introduces the *Philosophy of Nature*, the phenomena of live matter are evidence of the necessary process by which the Idea must "release itself as nature freely out of itself" (*L Enc* §244). This cosmic entelechism (controversial as it may be) is for Hegel the logical foundation of the soul's real progressing toward spirit in stages whose sequence is necessary. But this entelechism and the necessity of the progression do not imply that all the connotations of the concept of nature must be exhaustively actualized in each and every objectification of it—in each inorganic system, organic species, or living specimen.

There is a remark in Hegel's treatment of human madness (about which more in the next chapter) that tersely illustrates his understanding of the dialectical relation between concepts and their real instantiations. In that context, Hegel argues that insanity can properly be attributed only to human individuals who, having attained rational or objective self-consciousness, relapse into the inner world of self-feeling. Insanity is not an arrested development, but a capitulation of rational judgment and action to the ever-present

inner world of feeling. Without this capitulation and retreat one might find weakness of mind or character, but no derangement. Only the latter is properly called a disorder, insofar as it inverts the logical order of the stages of the soul.²⁰ It should also be noted that the fact that self-feeling is a connotation of the general concept of the human soul does not imply that every human individual must experience the reversal that brings about derangement. It only implies that every individual must traverse the stage at which self-feeling is predominant. For example, the greater simplicity and abstractness of self-feeling (compared with the complexity and concreteness of objective self-consciousness) prevails during childhood, yet childhood is not a deranged state of human development.

Hegel draws an additional parallel to a conceptual constellation taken from an entirely different context, namely the political sphere of freedom, right, and right infringement. It does not follow, from the proof that the potential for the violation of right is intrinsic to the concept of free agency, that each free agent must commit crimes. The same holds true with regard to the developmental stages of the soul. First, it does not follow from the logical necessity of their order that their singular realizations in nature must develop into the next: neither every species nor each specimen, once sentient, has to rise to feeling, then intelligence and will, and then consciousness. It also does not follow from the logical sequence of stages that every specimen will be subject to pathological inversions. Since the whole of nature is the external actualization of the Idea, only nature as a whole must exhibit the actualization of every logical stage.

The method by which Hegel reconstructs the transition from sentience to feeling unfolds along a pattern familiar to his readers. Physical systems are characterized by “universal motion,” that is, the permanent overcoming of persisting oppositions internal to them. Living systems are no exception to the law of universal motion. The oppositional forces in the sentient soul seek resolution. The capacity for feeling emerges as such a temporary resolution, namely, as a sublation of the tension essential to sentience. This tension is transfigured and carried over into self-feeling, which is a new receptacle of antagonistic forces. Despite the radical novelty represented by this new faculty vis-à-vis sensibility, irritability, and sentience, feeling still belongs to the preconscious phases of spirit’s development. What we find described in the following is therefore the soul’s emancipation, not from nature as such, but from natural immediacy.

In Hegel’s own assessment, what follows is an “equally difficult and interesting part of the Anthropology” (*Enc* §402 *Zus*). The transition into the feeling soul is described as one in which the opposition between oneness and multiplicity finds resolution by becoming elevated (sublated) onto a higher plane. The many singular sensations give way to the feeling of their connection, both a corporeal and incorporeal one. They become affections of one, namely “my” body, as much as affections *for* one, namely “my” selfness.

These are not causal connections; their belonging together cannot be known discursively. It can merely be felt. In the process, the soul's self-doubling is reflected in the fact that in each sensation it also senses itself as the receiver of that sensation. Yet this selfness cannot in turn be a sensation, in that selfness is rather the place where all sensations arise and fade away (*Enc* §402 Zus). Hence, the feeling soul denotes a living individual in which multiple and diverse sensations converge into the feeling of *having* them. No longer just present *in* the soul, they are now also *for* it.

In feeling, sensations are therefore experienced as a cohesive—albeit not yet coherent—totality to which Hegel refers as “the selfness [*Selbstischkeit*] that lies therein” (*Enc* §402 Anm). While the soul is no longer caught in each sensation as it arises and is replaced by another, its identity as a medium of sensations is not a conscious one. The mediation of sensations through feeling and self-feeling is still entirely antecedent to consciousness. With the rise of feeling, a subjectively *significant* world is born, suspended in the shadowy realm between indifferent sentience and meaningful representation. Hegel also refers to this subjective world as “the presaging soul [*die ahnende Seele*]”:

Between *representational consciousness* . . . and *immediate sentience* . . . there is . . . the self-feeling or *presaging soul* in its *totality* and *universality* . . . What I am sentient of [*empfinde*] at this stage, that I *am*, and what I am, is what I am sentient of. I am here *immediately present* in the content which only later, once I have become objective *consciousness*, appears to me as an *independent* world opposite me. (*Enc* §402 Zus)

The momentous novelty represented by feeling consists of the fact that sensations are not being sublated *as* sensations, but as their idealized or “negative” form. In feeling, sensations become significant ciphers. They are now not just in but for the individual in its progression toward a fully concrete, or conscious, being-for-self. Even the feeling self, however, is still only an abstract being-for-self: “As feeling, the soul is no longer only natural, but inward individuality; this . . . initially formal *being for self* shall be made independent and free” (*Enc* §403).

As the next chapter will show, Hegel identifies in the indistinctness of self-feeling the most fertile terrain for the psychic schisms which, when lacking resolution, manifest themselves as maladies of the soul (*Seelenkrankheiten*). The Addition to §402 states why the logic of these maladies is best explained in the theoretical context of the feeling soul: “this is the standpoint of its [the feeling soul’s] diremption [*Entzweiung*] within itself.” On the one hand, the individual soul is still overwhelmingly the natural organism it has been since its inception (quite literally, *ab ovo*): a blind receiver of impressions, a prisoner of its determinacies. On the other hand, the soul is now also a crucible of those determinacies. It differs from each determinacy

while retaining them all—albeit “*virtualiter*” (*Enc* §403 Anm). The feeling soul occupies “a middle stage between immediate natural life and objective, free consciousness” (*Enc* §402 Zus). With this, the feeling soul has become the natural blueprint of conscious egoity. The soul is now, as this Addition summarizes, “on the one hand self-possessed, on the other, not self-possessed but still trapped in one singular particularity.” This is the internal rift (the schizoid self-cleavage) in which, Hegel later claims, most forms of mental disease find a nurturing soil. It is also the psychic frailty on which hypnotizers, mesmerizers, and other seducers can successfully exercise their power.

Hegel’s reconstruction of the dynamics of the feeling soul can be outlined as follows. First (α), the soul self-identifies as a physical whole (the body), as the seat of incessant appearances and disappearances of sensations; second (β), a rift develops between the corporeal and the immaterial dimensions of this uncertain, indefinite selfness; and third (γ), the relation between these two sides becomes increasingly imbalanced, insofar as the immateriality of the soul acquires greater control over its physicality than the reverse. The details of spirit’s taking charge of corporeity through the mastery of bodily skill, and the human habituation to such mastery, comprise the subject matter of the final four sections of the *Anthropology*. It is here that Hegel will show how the soul can fully actualize its concept, that is, how the human individual (*der Mensch*) can be fully realized only through the negative work of idealizing physicality.

3. The Monadic Soul: On Dreaming, Fetal Life, and Hypnosis

As feeling, the soul is no longer a purely physiological, “irritable” receiver of sensations. The soul is therefore no longer at the exclusive mercy of the environment’s physical impacts, nor is it reduced to passive affectability. It now relates its affections to a “self-like” center that it *foreshadows* through the psychological equivalent of cognitive intuition. As we have seen, Hegel calls this a “presaging” of the conscious ego in a stage of spirit that is still preponderantly natural. From a logical standpoint, while sentience is the soul’s first being-in-itself, feeling is its first “being-for-self” (*Enc* §403). Only consciousness is the existence of spirit in-and-for-itself, a phase in which the soul will no longer be just soul but spirit proper. From the perspective of a philosophy of spirit, the chief significance of the convergence of sensed determinacies in one felt inwardness lies in the fact that this convergence signals the *psychic birth* of an individual subjectivity that is no longer a mere natural process.

In feeling, the soul conserves all its sentient determinations not despite but because it negates their exclusively somatic character. In other words: sensations are still the main contents of the soul, but now in virtualized form. By negating the nature of its sensations as mere stimuli of the nervous system, the feeling soul transforms them into an “idealized” totality:

Nowhere as much as with the soul, and even more with spirit, is it essential for the understanding to grasp the determination of *ideality*, namely that ideality is *negation* of the real, while at the same time the latter is also *preserved*, contained *virtualiter* despite its nonexistence. (*Enc* §403 Anm)²¹

However much the contents of feeling differ from feeling selfness, none of them conveys information about their putative external sources. Felt sensations only constitute a given infinite multiplicity, most of which remains unnoticed by the feeling individual. Leibniz called these *les petites perceptions*.²² This is why even in objectively diseased conditions in which self-feeling overwhelms self-consciousness, an individual's practical relation to the world may seem unaffected by the reversal that has taken place. While the world of feeling is a preconscious state in which the individual is largely unaware of externality, it is not necessarily a state antagonistic to externality.

The transformation from physiological impression to virtual reality or feeling is explained by Hegel as a transformation of physical sensations into internalized experiences—hence an inwardization or *Erinnerung*. At the level of the feeling soul, the “selfness” in question is a universality (as all forms of selfhood are) that contains physiological particularities in virtual form. As the soul converts these into feelings, the individual becomes increasingly able to distance itself—or rather, its intuited selfness—from them. At first,

the feeling of self, sunk in the particularity of feelings (simple sensations, also urges, drives, passions and their satisfactions), is indistinguishable from them. But the self is . . . simple relation of ideality to itself, formal universality, which is the truth of this particularity; the self . . . is *for-itself universality* that self-differentiates from the particularity . . . The particular being of the soul is the moment of its *corporeity*, from which it now breaks away. (*Enc* §409)

Despite the theoretically challenging, dialectical structure of the identity and difference of sensations, feelings, and self-feeling, it is precisely this cluster of relations that, as will be shown in the next chapter, is essential for appreciating Hegel's explanation of healthy and diseased forms of the mental life of humans.

The feeling soul, this most sophisticated of preconscious stages of mental life, is hard to capture without the use of metaphors:

Every individual is an infinite wealth of sense-determinations, representations, cognitions, thoughts and so forth; but through it all I am still an utterly *simple*—an indeterminate shaft [*ein bestimmungsloser Schacht*] in which all this is preserved without existing. (*Enc* §403 Anm)

Despite the difficulty presented by the attempt to define and describe the feeling soul as a process that is both immediate and mediated, one and multiple, Hegel makes only minimal recourse to metaphors. Because discursiveness requires (by definition) mediation, philosophical language is not the most apt to explicate relations of immediacy. In the present case, the philosopher's task is to explain spiritual-somatic processes by which immediate and passive *sensations* become mediated and hence transformed into a content *felt* as if it belonged exclusively to a One.²³

This overcoming and preservation of originally sensible contents is better expressed through the poetic craft than through the discursive arts. The advantage of poetry over philosophy in these subject matters is that poetry can put into words what are otherwise inarticulable constellations, for example, unperceived perceptions (Leibniz's *petites perceptions*) or the un-knowing intuiting (Hegel's *Ahnung*). Hegel is no poet, but as the quoted passage above shows, he does develop at least one memorable metaphor for conveying the result of the transition from sensing to feeling: the selfness of the feeling soul must be represented as an "indeterminate shaft in which all . . . is preserved without existing." There are countless poetic accounts of the feeling soul's activity and contents that are more detailed, and perhaps more persuasive, than Hegel's. One example by a contemporary Afghan novelist is a striking illustration of the nature of the "presaging soul":

. . . somewhere inside me a thought was growing. I tried to pull the thought into my consciousness, but no matter how I tried, it could not show itself. Some power was holding the thought back, keeping it in hiding. The thought kept struggling to free itself . . . In a state somewhere between sleeping and waking, I began to see that the world was full of strings. Long strings and short strings . . . Thick strings and thin strings. But all too strong to be broken. And suddenly I saw that each string was tied to someone's foot . . . I too had a string on my foot. (R. Zaryab, "The Hawk and the Tree" [1979], 2019)

We find the ethical counterpart of the *Anthropology*'s "indeterminate shaft" of self-feeling in the earlier *Phenomenology of Spirit*'s "innermost precipice" and "bottomless depth" of self-alienated spirit—a false depth with no import except for caprice, a vapid frivolity that lacks any substance.²⁴ Even more elaborate is Hegel's dismissal of feeling-based ethical knowledge in the *Philosophy of Right*'s middle section dedicated to "Morality." Feeling-based ethics and politics are subjectivistic moral cognitions that ignore actually existing "principles and duties." Appeals to the feeling-based conscience of the politician or other public figure (influential moralists and famous theologians in Hegel's time, politicians and public intellectuals in ours), when separated from the ethical reality of the law, produce an untouchable "*sanctum*," the

exclusive and arcane moral privilege of those claiming to know good and evil based on their own feelings (*RPh* §137 and Anm).

Hegel's metaphors in these passages of the *Anthropology* do help clarify crucial logical and ontological connotations of his subject: while the feeling soul belongs to the world, conversely it also holds the whole world in itself—just like a Leibnizian monad of monads. In the phenomenal sphere of human cognitive development, this reciprocal relation of containment is reflected in the earliest cognitive relations of individuals to their environment. Before the onset of the psyche's self-differentiations into preconscious and conscious states, the only "external" relation of the individual is to its own body, which it experiences as reality *tout court*. There are no two substances vying for primacy at this stage, but only one. Corporeal sensations merge into one virtual reality:

Here, this *simplicity* of the soul consists at first of its being a feeling soul, in which corporeity [*Leiblichkeit*] is contained . . . Since the *multiplicity* of many *representations* . . . hardly grounds exteriority and real plurality in the "I," so the real externality of corporeity carries no truth for the feeling soul . . . Hence the body also does not count as a limit; the soul is the *existent* Concept, the existence of the speculative. . . in this way, in the feeling soul corporeity is reduced to *ideality*, to the *truth* of the natural manifold. (*Enc* §403 Anm)

The peculiar relation of the feeling soul to its own physicality forms the basis not only of philosophical (Neoplatonist) doctrines of the body as fully "permeated" by the soul, but of practical cultural feats in which individuals display sovereign indifference to the normal physiology of their bodies. Fakirs and monks, ascetics and penitents, saints and mystics of all religious hues demonstrate extraordinary command over their bodies, obtained by a training that enables them to lower and immerse themselves into self-feeling. In this state the body, not "counting as something real," offers little resistance to the commands of the soul. The exotic deeds that modern individuals can only interpret (or discount) as inexplicable triumphs of spirit over body prove rather that others are able to harness the universal moment of *Selbstgefühl* (self-feeling) for cultural and religious practices for which modern civil society no longer has any use.

The sentient totality that constitutes the feeling soul implies, like all individuality, exclusion and differentiation. Yet these activities are entirely internal to the feeling soul, since the latter does not discern an outer reality—not even its corporeity, which is merely felt but not cognized as one body among others. The subsequent phases of spirit's development will quite literally be defined by spirit's capacities for differentiating between inner and outer worlds—for example, between perception and the perceived, between thought and the object of thought. But at the feeling stage this discrimination

is neither relevant nor possible. Just as only a universal substance can differentiate accidents among themselves and from itself by making them into *its own* accidents, so the feeling soul can only discriminate among sensations, and between itself and its sensations, from a purely internal point of view.

This wholly inward individuality of feeling is in a sense a “stage of spirit’s darkness [*Stufe seiner Dunkelheit*]” (*Enc* §404 Anm)—especially when compared with the stage of consciousness, which all philosophy since Plato has referred to as the source of light. The shadowy world of feeling, however, ought not to be discounted as primitive, exotic, or diseased. It is a necessary, healthy stage of natural individuality’s path to consciousness. The life of feeling, as indicated above, only shows symptoms of mental disease when consciousness and self-consciousness withdraw, and self-feeling prevails.

Hegel’s empirical illustrations of the soul’s “stage of darkness” are quite helpful. If the feeling self is a preconscious version of selfhood (Hegel calls it “selfness” or “*selflike* individuality” in the quote that follows), and if all feeling consists of a gradual disentanglement from somatic sentience, we ought not to be surprised by such facts as the existence of hypnotism or the psychical symbiosis of mother and fetus. In the first case, the temporary relinquishment of one’s natural will to another individual in the hypnotic relation amounts to a voluntary lending of one’s felt selfness to another; in the second case, the temporary sharing of the feeling world by two physically distinct individuals, the mother and the unborn child, is an involuntary example of the same constellation.

In agreeing to hypnotic therapy the patient volunteers to provisionally entrust her feeling self to another. In dire cases, she may end up alienating herself completely to the other. The hypnotist’s core personality (his or her *Genius*)²⁵ becomes then the master of the hypnotized individual.

The feeling individuality is indeed at first a monadic individual . . . , not yet . . . an inwardly reflected subject, and is thus *passive*. Hence, its *selflike* individuality is a subject different from it, one that may also be another individual, whose selfness [*Selbstischkeit*] . . . traverses and determines it pervasively . . . without encountering resistance; this [other] subject can therefore be called its *Genius*. (*Enc* §405)

The natural sharing of one selfness between mother and child during gestation is a case of the entirely involuntary sharing of the feeling psyche among two individuals. The fetus and the mother are inseparable but also distinct organisms; they differ insofar as one is conscious spirit, the other is not. The subconscious psyche they share is the mother’s selfness: “The mother is the *Genius* of the child” (*Enc* §405 Anm). The mother is not only a feeling totality for herself, but also for the undeveloped individuality she carries in her. Though biologically distinct and singular, the fetus has no inward individuality. It is “only exogenously posited as individual” (*Enc* §405 Anm). Not

entirely unlike the symbiosis taking place in hypnotism, the fetus's selfness subsists only as the selfness of its host.

There are further manifestations of this purely self-mediated, so-called magical²⁶ condition of the soul: somnambulism, sleep, dreaming, trance, portents of all kinds (see *Enc* §402 Zus); some psychosomatic diseases (*Enc* §405 Zus); as well as clairvoyance (*Enc* §406 Zus) and all the purported divinations of the ancients. Last but not least, even the quotidian connection of conscious agency with subconscious feeling in every individual is proof of this relation of immediacy between the self-feeling soul and its body.

Relations of cause and effect, ground and grounded, antecedent and consequent mean nothing to self-feeling immediacy. Hence, discursive explications of it will be laden with paradoxes. Still, the sealed-off quality of feeling is precisely what enables our grasp of the widespread psychological conditions illustrated in the Additions to these sections. As will be shown shortly, the immediacy of self-feeling is also key in the explication of human mental disease since this consists, in all its forms, of the inability to complement one's feeling selfness with one's conscious self. For example, the destruction by war or revolution of real-world structures that make up an individual's *Genius*—the childhood places, languages, customs, beliefs, familiar connections, and political and religious contexts that form the core of one's personality—often leads to mental illness. Among these illnesses (and following Philippe Pinel)²⁷ Hegel prominently ranks “religious and political exaltation.” His examples reach from the ancient Stoics' famous choices of death by suicide, to the malaise of homesick emigrés and exiled artists, whose muses wither away, to pathological forms of mourning the past or grieving for the dead.

From an epistemic perspective, the phase of psyche's feeling corresponds to the faculty of immediate intuition (*Anschauung*). This is why Hegel also refers to the feeling soul as an inward seeing (*Anschauen*) or “the self-gazing of the *Genius*” (*Enc* §406 Anm). And just as the promotion of intuition to the status of superior knowledge results in lack of knowledge, so the elevation of mere feeling to the status of a superior, more insightful, authentic life, as advocated in the Romantic movement, is an intellectually crude operation that can only result in quackery. Ethically, the moral intuitionist's claim is that the life of feeling, contrary to the life of objectifying reason, provides genuine knowledge of reality by a simple beholding of it—a spontaneous gazing at reality:

This beholding [*Anschauen*] is *clairvoyance* [*Hellsehen*] insofar as it is knowledge in the undifferentiated substantiality of the *Genius* . . . Yet this clairvoyance . . . is *prey* to all sorts of *contingency* of feeling, imagining, and so on, not to mention the intrusion of *extrinsic* representations in it . . . It is crude . . . to consider the seeing of this condition as an elevation of spirit and as . . . better suited . . . to *universal* cognitions. (*Enc* §406 Anm)

Once again, it is Hegel's view that ancient philosophers had a superior grasp of the prerational nature and workings of the soul. A footnote to the just-quoted Remark calls attention to Plato's *Timaetus*²⁸ as establishing, in a theoretical framework that includes both physiological and psychological considerations, the paradoxical intelligibility of madness. According to Hegel's reading, one finds in Plato's treatment of the condition of *enthousiasmos* as enabling divinatory capacities a more sophisticated approach to the existence of foresight and clairvoyance than that offered by modern conjectures on the alleged insights of shamans, prophets, and somnambulists—some of whose visions Hegel does not hesitate to brand as *Schwärmerei*, or “ramblings” (*Enc* §406 Anm). Indeed, in the *Timaetus* we are reminded of the necessity to open up diviners' “dark sayings and visions” to the light of reflection. This can be delivered by the seer himself, but only “after recovery of his wits.” Alternately (and arguably in a more reliable way), enlightenment can be attained by these visions' exegesis delivered by nonprophets, that is, the wise. Moreover, and in contrast to some modern philosophers, Plato is entirely cognizant of the corporeal, organic rootedness of “phantoms and visions” (*Timaetus* 71a). The liver having been created by a divinity, it is now the “seat of divination,” that is, the organic foundation of oracular faculties (*Timaetus* 71b–e). Just like Hegel, Plato does not dismiss the intelligible nature and cognitive value of visionary insight, but he ranks it lower than the insight afforded by reason: “God has given the art of divination not to the wisdom, but to the madness of man When one receives the inspired word, either his intelligence is enthralled in sleep, or he is demented by some distemper or possession” (*Timaetus* 71e). It is not to the wisdom, but to the madness of man that Hegel dedicates the next major section of the *Anthropology*.

Chapter 7



Disorders

There is no folly of the beasts of the earth which is not infinitely outdone by the madness of men.

—Herman Melville, *Moby-Dick; or, the Whale*

1. Healthy and Diseased Schisms of the Soul

The systematic placement of human insanity in the treatment of the individual soul (*Enc* §408, including its Remark and one of the most extensive and meticulous Additions in this treatise) makes it clear that the wellspring of potential derangement is for Hegel the feeling-stage of the soul. We have seen that the latter results from the internal conversion of entirely subconscious contents of sentience (*Empfindungen*) into a preconscious awareness (*Selbstgefühl*) of those contents as belonging together in one selfness (*Selbstschkeit*). This conversion is characterized in §407 as an “awakening” of the purely sentient soul to feeling and self-feeling.¹ For a number of reasons given by Hegel in the sections on the feeling soul (*Enc* §§403–10) and discussed in the previous chapter, this awakening must be considered as inherently precarious. One of the main reasons for this instability is the impossibility for the feeling subject to distinguish between endogenous and exogenous sources of its feelings and self-feeling. For this subject, mind, body, or external objectivity may all indifferently play the role of source of feeling. The distinction will only become relevant from the subsequent perspective of consciousness, when the soul will have achieved completion of all its potentialities. Identifying the center of feeling—the individual’s “selfness”—as inwardness over against some external objectivity is only possible for the self-conscious subject.

If, as Hegel argues, self-feeling is the stage at which the soul is uniquely susceptible to becoming unbalanced, it will not come as a surprise that the chief features of self-feeling also mark common forms of derangement. For example, in the case of individuals whose rational consciousness of objectivity is inhibited (on account of a number of circumstances Hegel discusses in the following) and becomes supplanted by a retreat into the world of feeling,

the lack of distinction between inner and outer contents, and the consequent inability to rise above the particularity of their worldviews, become prominent marks of insanity.

In their broadest outlines, the classifications of types of insanity most *en vogue* in the early nineteenth century originated in the studies of a previous generation of thinkers. Prominent among these was the Scottish physician William Cullen (1710–90), a proponent of “melancholia,” “mania,” and “dementia” as major classifications of human derangement. We find these types again in §408 of the *Anthropology*, albeit in modified form. Hegel’s further categorizations and subclassifications of mental diseases—which he refers to throughout as “soul-illnesses,” *Seelenkrankheiten*—are informed by predecessors like Kant and by contemporaries like Philippe Pinel (1745–1826) and Vincenzo Chiarugi (1759–1820). The latter two, who were celebrated psychiatric reformers in their time, can be said to have an equal claim to being the founders of modern psychiatry. Both men benefited from favorable political conditions—the French Revolution and the enlightened rulership of the dukedom of Tuscany, respectively—which allowed them to introduce and publicly defend revolutionary practices like the unchaining of patients.² Hegel, however, refers exclusively to Pinel’s classifications of types of madness, as well as to his methods of treatment.

Pinel’s “Memoir on Madness” of 1794 (Pinel 1992) defines mental illness in terms of self-estrangement—*aliénation mentale*. Like Chiarugi, Pinel advocates replacing the old regime’s corporeal “treatments” that were undistinguishable from corporeal punishments with a “moral treatment,” that is, with a primarily social and discursive engagement with the mentally alienated. Pinel’s allegiance to revolutionary ideology is best captured by his famous formulation: “One must be able to subdue agitated madmen while respecting human rights” (Pinel 1992, 731).³ Chiarugi’s appeal to the physician’s need to display “philosophical comportment,” written in the same year, is the eloquent counterpart of the French revolutionary’s vision:

It is necessary that he who directs the therapy of the melancholics . . . may capture their confidence and trust . . . This ought to be done with shrewd sensitiveness, and with out-of-the-ordinary prudence, with a truly philosophical comportment . . . It is . . . absolutely damaging to use methods . . . like open animosity, menacing, or even beatings . . . It is much easier to guide these unfortunates toward knowledge of the truth with gentleness . . . , instilling reason in them, so to speak, drop by drop. (Chiarugi [1793–94] 1991, 2:67–68)

Hegel’s classificatory criteria are still of interest, both as an influential part of the early history of modern psychiatry and vis-à-vis current nosologies—an interesting fact in view of the advances claimed by psychiatric theory in the nearly two centuries since Hegel’s death. Despite the historical and perhaps

even scientific interest of Hegel's classifications of derangement types and their clinical manifestations, the philosophical conception of the soul's dynamic that forms their foundation is of far greater relevance. In the following, therefore, we begin with a summary exposition of several features previously encountered in the general exposition of *Seele* and culminating in the concept of the feeling and self-feeling soul. We will then be able to see how these same features resurface like a precipitate, as it were, in the explication of the psyche's deranged states.

The first and most general feature is the jointly twofold ontological status of the soul (or natural spirit) as distinguishable but not separable from spirit proper. The soul's being both natural and spiritual or, at the level of the individual organism, both bodily and mental, explains various otherwise perplexing statements made by Hegel in the section on madness. Principal among these is the claim that insanity can only affect the soul but not spirit as such, because

spirit is free and thus for itself incapable of this disease. Spirit has been considered by the earlier metaphysics in terms of *soul*, as *thing*, and [indeed] only as thing, i.e., as a *natural entity* and as *being* [*als* *Natürliches und Seiendes*], is it capable of derangement, in that finitude cleaves to it. (*Enc* §408 Anm)

It must be noted that Hegel is not always faithful to his own terminological rules: despite the explicit rejection of the common term *Geisteskrankheit* ("illness of spirit") in favor of *Seelenkrankheit* ("illness of the soul") in this context, we do find *Geisteskrankheit* used more than once, particularly in the transcribed Addition to this section. This may be due to liberties taken by the transcribers, but it may also be explained by Hegel's implicit employment of *Geist*, in this particular treatment of subjective spirit, as a stand-in for "finite" spirit, that is, for the soul-dependent spirit of human individuals.

A further feature that the feeling soul bequeaths to insanity is the non-mediated nature of the relation that obtains between the soul's own two dimensions. In the soul's emerging states, as we saw in chapter 1, nature and spirit are undifferentiated. This lack of differentiation, when reenacted at higher levels of development, to which also belongs a relapse into self-feeling from self-consciousness, is a blueprint for the inability, typical of the deranged, to distinguish between the bodily and the spiritual or between the outward and the inward. This is, we may say, an epistemic inability with practical consequences. Self-conscious individuals are able to discern their own double aspect, that is, their being souls and hence corporeal and spiritual at once; individuals who are merely self-feeling cannot, or can no longer, draw the distinction for themselves.

From the immediacy of the connection between the two dimensions of the soul, it follows that talk of "mental illness" is only meaningful if it is meant

to include at once the somatic and spiritual dimensions of the individual affected: “Hence derangement is a disease of the psychical [*des Psychischen*], undividedly of body and spirit; the inception [of the disease] may appear to originate more from the one side or from the other, and likewise the healing” (*Enc* §408 Anm). Accordingly, one of the major consequences of Hegel’s metaphysical concept of the soul for the many existing types and subtypes of insanity identified in the *Addition* is that all genuine forms of derangement must be psychosomatic at their core.

There is no terminological equivalent of “psychosomatic” in Hegel’s text, despite the fact that by his time the term “psychosomatism” had been in use for at least a century and a half: its earliest use appears in the seventeenth-century treatise *De praxi medica* by the Cartesian “iatromechanick” Giorgio Baglivi.⁴ Hegel does not follow this usage, we must assume, because his “soul-like” substance—*das Psychische* or *das Seelenhafte*—already refers to the somatic and psychic unity of all motions, healthy or diseased ones, that affect the human mind. Perhaps he is careful to avoid the compound term (just as he avoids “hylomorphism”) in order not to be misunderstood as raising the specter of the dualist conceptions that he has been criticizing all along. This notwithstanding, his “psychosomatic” grasp of all mental disease is made explicit in several passages like the following, in which he highlights that, since corporeity is a necessary condition for the very existence of spirit, the latter in its soul-like stages always already shares in corporeity: “The *soul-disease* is not just *comparable* with *bodily* disease but is more or less connected with it because . . . corporeity, being . . . necessary for the empirical existence of what is soul-like [*das Seelenhafte*] and of spirit, shares in both” (*Enc* §406 Zus).

A further crucial feature of Hegel’s account of insanity is related to the structural-logical differences between the faculties of sentience (*Empfindung*), feeling (*Gefühl*), and grasping (*Begreifen*), namely their respective singular, particular, and universal import. This structural difference between the soul’s ways of relating to a content informs a further characteristic of all genuine forms of insanity: the spontaneous limitation of individuals’ outlooks to particularistic concerns. Sentience is only of singular affections, while comprehension is a grasp of concepts; but feeling pertains to particularity. When one’s mental territory is no longer surveyed and ordered by concepts, one’s feelings step in:

The feeling totality as individuality consists essentially of this: to differentiate oneself in oneself and to awaken *to the diremption in oneself* [zum Urteil in sich] according to which [individuality] has *particular* feelings . . . The subject as such posits these as *its* feelings *in itself*. It is sunk in the *particularity* of sensations . . . In this way it is *self-feeling*—and it is this, moreover, only in the *particular feeling*. (*Enc* §407)

A conscious individual is a thinking subject who grasps the world as objective: *die gegenständliche Welt* is a world “standing opposite” to the thinker. For Hegel, objective or rational consciousness denotes the understanding activity (*Verstand*) or, in pejorative or polemical contexts, ratiocination (*das Rasonnieren*), because conscious individuality is not *eo ipso* reason (*Vernunft*). Still, even the activity of the understanding is universal in that it moves discursively among concepts—not among perceptions, feelings, and the like. The feeling soul, however, is only a prelude to the “I” that is conscious of the world and of itself. It only deals with its own particular conditions, relating them to an as-yet indistinct unity. We have already seen that Hegel refers to this unity with apt vagueness (and in Swabian idiom) as *Selbstischkeit* or “selfness” (*Enc* §402 Anm, §405, and §412 Zus), a herald of egotic selfhood. This selfness is a normal and necessary phase of individual psychic development. It only qualifies as derangement when a conscious, rational individual relapses into it, reenabling it as the leading authority for her judgments and actions. When in this condition, the individual endows her particular worldviews, beliefs, interests, or fears with the status of objective universals—despite contrary evidence provided by her still active but subdued consciousness. In sum: Hegel’s general characterization of the deranged is that they are rational individuals who take refuge—but find no solace—in the subjective particularity of their feelings. They have lost, in other words, the ability to take stock of the world they share with all others.

2. Leading a Twofold Life: On Double *genii* and Bipolar Magnets

There are four passages preceding the “derangement section” (§408) that prepare us for a full appreciation of that section. These passages belong to the following sections: (i) §392 Anm, (ii) §402 Zus, (iii) §405 Zus, and (iv) §407. In yet another section (§403) we find a succinct articulation of the leitmotif of Hegel’s thinking about the exquisitely human potential for derangement:

The feeling individual is the *simple ideality*, subjectivity of sentence. Its task is to *posit* its substantiality, its merely in-itself content, as subjectivity, to take possession of itself and to become for itself its own power. As feeling, the soul is no longer merely natural but inward individuality. This . . . at first merely formal *being-for-self* is to be made independent and to be liberated. (*Enc* §403)

The feeling soul subjectifies its own sensations: by being made into virtual contents, sensations as a whole become one sensing of sentence.⁵ In Hegel’s view, this virtualizing or “idealizing” conversion is so complex that the feeling

soul becomes inherently unstable in ways that the merely sentient soul is not. In particular circumstances, the feeling soul becomes a breeding ground for the subject's instability or disorder. In the healthy individual, the inner world of feeling and the outer world of consciousness coexist because they only differ. In the deranged individual, they clash:

The peculiarity of this condition . . . [is] the fact that in *derangement* the *soul-like* [substance] is no longer in a relation of *mere difference* from *objective* consciousness but in a relation of *direct opposition*, and thus no longer *mingles* with it. (*Enc* §408 Zus)

Derangement is therefore not the complete absence of reason, “just like physical illness is not . . . complete loss of health” (*Enc* §408 Anm), but an active opposition between feeling and reason. Derangement, we could say, is an autoimmune disorder of the soul.

(i) The first passage (*Enc* §392 Anm) leading up to the derangement section pertains to the earlier treatment of the soul's so-called qualities (*Enc* §§392–95, discussed earlier in chapter 3). Even fully self-conscious subjects continue to be influenced, albeit below the threshold of consciousness, by cosmic or terrestrial forces. The reason for this is that consciousness is and remains an integral part of the psychosomatic whole or “totality” that is a living individual. Of course, this relation is not limited to the individual's symbiosis with her physical environment, but also involves her relation to her own body. In human beings, the capacity to bracket out the conscious distinction of mind and body and turn inward to the feeling of their immediate identity is in evidence, for example, in the role this withdrawal plays in hypnotic states. The same regression also makes possible the somatization of feeling. Hegel does not use the term “somatization” but, acknowledging a tradition that reaches as far back as the Hippocratic definition of hysteria, he uses *Verleiblichung*, “embodiment.”⁶ In this section, we also find mention of the fact that the normally imperceptible impact of circadian forces such as daily and seasonal rhythms may have noticeable effects in human individuals “in diseased states, including derangement [*Verrücktheit*], in the depression of self-conscious life” (*Enc* §392 Anm).⁷

(ii) A further conception directly relevant to the presuppositions of Hegel's understanding of insanity is found in the Addition to §402, where Hegel describes the immediate connection (“simultaneity”) between the individual's attainment of self-feeling and her realization of being distinct from her own body:

With that, we have given the transition to the . . . second division of the Anthropology, in which the soul opposes itself to its substantiality, confronts itself, and simultaneously attains in its own determinate sensations the feeling of itself. (*Enc* §402 Zus)

As indicated earlier, this internal cleavage emerges between one's existence as a *singular multiplicity*, that is, a oneness of singular sensations, and one's existence as a *particular totality*, that is, one particular unity of interwoven sensations.⁸ The feeling selfness that results from this movement is the prelude to self-consciousness, which, at this stage, is a mere potentiality suspended as it were in the shadowy realm of feeling (*Enc* §403 Anm).⁹ This opaque awareness of oneself as a distinct unit in a broader, non-self-like context may be exemplified by the infant's tentative exploration of her bodily boundaries, or by the dimmed self-reference of mature individuals in hypnotic trance. In the fragile phase of feeling, when the soul is no longer mere sentience nor yet objective consciousness, it is most at risk of being torn asunder. Hence, this stage is the breeding ground of mental self-estrangement.

It is important to highlight here that in Hegel's conception, feeling does not just lie midway between the singularity of sensation, on the one hand, and the universality of thought, on the other. Feeling actually overlaps both because it represents a developmental phase in which the soul has not yet attained the "dissociation of what is subjective and what is objective [*Trennung des Subjektiven und des Objektiven*]" (*Enc* §402 Zus) that is integral to mental health. Hegel even calls this dissociation a "first liberation" of the individual from sensuous immediacy, and he refers to the feeling soul's dynamics as a battle to liberate the individual from subservience to sentience and sensibility:

Only the "I" that has freed itself, albeit at first in an abstract manner, from its immediate content [*Stoff*] allows this very content the freedom to subsist *outside* the "I." Hence, what we have to consider until we reach this goal is the struggle for liberation [*Befreiungskampf*] that the soul must fight against the immediacy of its substantial contents, so that it may . . . become adequate to its concept. (*Enc* §402 Zus)

Until the goal is reached, the soul's struggle against its own physical immediacy is precisely what makes it a vulnerable target of, among other things, therapeutic practices like hypnotism and Mesmerism.

Hegel discusses in more detail Franz Mesmer's (1734–1815) idea of "animal magnetism" and related questions of hypnotic therapies in the Addition to §406. Mesmerism was the result of a somewhat fantastic combination of archaic astrologies and modern science. It postulated that an invisible but physical "fluid" connection ties every living body to all other bodies, and indeed to the entire physical universe.¹⁰ This invisible force is conceived as resembling, or rather as having a real affinity with, the magnetic force-at-a-distance—equally invisible and "fluid"—that magnets exercise on metals. On this basis, Mesmer advocated viewing human individuals from a therapeutic point of view as living magnets. He explained somatic and psychological diseases as disturbances or even interruptions of the magnetic bond between the

individual and the rest of the world. Hence, the primary task of therapy must be the restoration of this bond. Mesmer's "cures," which were increasingly popular in the upper echelons of central European society in the eighteenth century, involved group trance sessions ("Mesmeric sleep") and handsome pecuniary compensations for the *magnetiseur*, or Mesmerist. Both of these factors raised suspicion in a world that was not yet accustomed to the combination of medical cure and financial gain. In 1784, Louis XVI assembled a scientific team (including Franklin, Lavoisier, and Bailly, among others) to investigate the matter. The eminent scientists, probably interpreting Mesmer's "magnetic fluid" as a measurable form of electric current, could find no sign of it. By royal decree, the fraudulent practices were banned. And yet major figures in France and Germany, all mentioned by Hegel in the Addition to §406 (Armand de Puységure, Karl A. Kluge, Pierre van Gehrt, and Friedrich Schelling's brother Karl), persisted in studying the magnetism of living individuals. Not one to exclude the possibility of learning new aspects of the psychophysical unity of human individuals, Hegel dryly comments that one may expect after all some good insights to come from French-style "naive metaphysics" (*Enc* §406 Zus).

There is one aspect of Mesmerism that Hegel embraces despite his biting critique of the psychological and psychiatric charlatanism (his word) associated with it. Interestingly, this is the one aspect of Mesmer's theory whose influence still lingers in contemporary psychiatry. I am referring to a theoretical consequence of Mesmer's conception of individual organisms as magnets endowed with opposite poles that are seamlessly connected through an imperceptible force to their environs. This conception's implication of bipolarism is the probable reason why Hegel does not straightforwardly discard animal magnetism altogether. Indeed, he explains why the phrase "animal magnetism" has been retained even after the demise of Mesmerism as a popular therapy:

There exists in *animal* magnetism, just as in *inorganic* magnetism, an immediate reciprocal relation between two existences [*zweier Existenzen*] . . . The condition in question is called variously Mesmerism, solarism, and tellurism. But the first of these designations does not mean anything, and the latter two concern an entirely different sphere from that of animal magnetism; the spiritual nature involved in the latter contains . . . a great deal more than just solar and telluric moments—entirely abstract determinations . . . of the natural soul that has not yet developed to individual subjectivity. (*Enc* §406 Zus)

In the derangement section, Hegel will argue specifically that the doubling of one individual as if she led "two existences" is the characteristic feature of madness properly so called (*Wahnsinn*), and hence a trait common to its varied manifestations.

(iii) The Addition to §405 contains a lengthy discussion of the peculiar relation of rational, conscious individuals to the innermost core of their personality, the *Genius*. This Addition also highlights the extraordinary conditions of the soul in its dreaming and fetal existence. The use of the term *Genius* on Hegel's part is particularly relevant to his later discussion of maladies of the soul. A few remarks on this now-obsolete notion will have to suffice here.

The meaning of the German word *Genius* as used in nineteenth-century writings is akin to that entailed by the English word "congeniality," indicating a somewhat inscrutable affinity of character, temperament, taste, and so on among different individuals. Hegel's older contemporaries Hamann and Herder borrowed *Genius* from the Renaissance Latin *genius* and used it as a synonym for individual *Geist*. The Grimm brothers (DW 5:2632–33) conjectured that behind this modern conception lay Socrates's *daimōn*, first cleansed from its Christian transfigurations as divine anointment or guardian angel, and then resurrected as the Romantics' "voice of the heart." The Latin *genius* was certainly the standard Renaissance rendition of *daimōn*, and by Hegel's time it had been widely adopted not just in literature and philosophy, but also in medicine. In the sections we are considering, Hegel uses *Genius* to denote the naturally and socially produced selfness (*Selbstischkeit*) that, in the absence of consciousness's direction, either dominates the immature soul or becomes the dominant power in a soul declining into insanity. He emphasizes that the *Genius* of an individual is not just a natural endowment, but the totality of one's innate and acquired needs, interests, and idiosyncrasies. Furthermore, in the Remarks to §§406 and 408, Hegel also rejects the widespread association of *Genius* with an inscrutable source of "evil": good and evil, he reminds his listeners, are coequal potentialities in the fathomless pit called conscience. An individual's *Genius* is therefore not just a possible source of evil; there is also the potentially good *Genius*.¹¹ The distinction between good and evil *Genius* can only be upheld if interpreted as a difference between the *Genius* of mere feeling, which excludes the otherness of objectivity, and the *Genius* of consciousness, which includes it. In health, the feeling *Genius* is a subdued presence, a sleeper in consciousness; whereas in disease, consciousness has become a sleeper in the feeling *Genius*.

The soul's oneiric and fetal conditions are definable as states in which an individual relates only to her *Genius*. When in one of these conditions, I am what my *Genius* is; I am in absolutely immediate relation to the core of my self-like substance. When dreaming, the soul is inextricably connected with its contents, which are virtualizations of sensations, affections, and experiences. As regards the fetus in the womb, the complete absence of experience makes it of course impossible for this individual organism to have any core content, any *Genius* of its own. The contents of its dreaming life can only be those of the mother. The latter's psyche is therefore the "self-like other" (*Enc* §405 Zus) of the fetus.

No matter whether unborn or sleeping, the dormant soul relates to its contents without mediation. This kind of direct connection, Hegel adds, is often said to be a “magic” relation. He is willing to accept this terminology insofar as the core meaning of the ancient notion of “magic” (*die Magie*) is that of unmediated efficacy:¹²

This standpoint may be called the *magic* relation of the feeling soul, because by this expression one denotes a relationship of inwardness to externality, or to otherness in general, that lacks any mediation. A magical power is one whose effect is not determined by connections, conditionings, and intermediations of objective circumstances; [it is] . . . un-mediatedly efficacious power. (*Enc* §405 Zus)

Equally interesting to Hegel are certain well-known social phenomena attributable to this kind of immediate efficacy. A manuscript remark (first reported by Helmut Schneider in 1972; translated by Petry in Hegel 1978)¹³ cites both the unmediated influence of powerful personalities over feeble characters, and the historically well-documented psychic toxicity of “epidemics of insanity” (*Enc* §405 Zus) like witch hunts. But the phenomenon of immediate efficacy is not limited to extreme life conditions, exotic happenings, or large-scale political occurrences. Every individual is abundantly acquainted with the quotidian “magic exercised by the individual spirit on its *own* corporeity, when it makes the latter into the subservient, docile executor of its will” (*Enc* §405 Zus).

(iv) Finally, §407 provides us with an all-important definition of the “sane mind” to help us grasp, by way of comparison and contrast, the internal dynamics of madness. The healthy mind, we read in this section, develops toward selfhood by becoming aware of its own “*inward diremption* [Urteil in sich].” By way of analogy, we may recall Hegel’s analysis of our quotidian awakening from sleep: it essentially consists of a daily return to the awareness that one’s former dormant selfness and one’s present waking consciousness are different states of an indivisible, self-identical unity. Hence, awakening is not primarily a renewed encounter with the world outside myself but, more fundamentally, a daily resurrection of my conscious “I” from my feeling selfness. Put in the abstract language of logic: awakening is a movement away from the particularity of feeling toward the universality of consciousness. It is this latter that enables the individual to recognize herself as the singular and selfsame bearer of the difference between particularity and universality or, in even more abstract terms, as a personification of the identity of identity and difference. By contrast, human insanity is characterized by the fact that this journey unfolds in the reverse. When a conscious, sociable, rational individual becomes exposed to traumatic events (for Hegel and Pinel these are mostly events of a historical, not private nature), then this individual is likely to be driven away from

her self-knowledge as identity of identity and difference back to a state of unresolved difference.

The foundation of Hegel's analysis of human types of insanity must therefore be sought in his theory of the natural diremptions of spirit-as-soul. These express themselves in the soul's transitions from the unmediated identity of its natural and spiritual moments (exemplified by dormancy and dreaming, embryonic life, or the immediate connection of a conscious individual to its *Genius*), through the first mediations by feeling and self-feeling, and finally to the all-mediating activities of spirit-as-consciousness. Each of these changes in and of the soul gives rise to temporarily uneven relations between opposite states—states of tension that, in a stable environment, are both healthy and necessary to living. Normally, the inner tension is resolved by the subsumption of the simpler and more abstract pole (for example, one's feeling-world) by the more concrete and complex one (for example, objective consciousness). In this dynamic, the contents of the antecedent shape of the psyche become "idealized" in the next, that is, they become virtual contents in and for the ensuing psychic shape.

The healthy mental condition is one in which the feeling soul is a unity despite subsisting in the tense space between sentience and consciousness, immediacy and mediation: on the one hand, feeling connects to the wholly subjective world of immediate affections, and on the other, it relates to the all-mediating world of thought. Healthy self-feeling is a mode of subjectivity that most of the time coexists successfully with rational subjectivity. A malady only sets in when the connection between these two modes of being subject is severed. My awareness of the objective order of the world then capitulates to my feeling about the world. The two orders no longer merely differ but are now incompatible; nothing is left of their relation but a fierce struggle in me. As already announced in the Addition to §406, the individual in this condition leads a "double *soul-life* [*ein zwiefaches . . . Seelenleben*]." The ability to act and perceive oneself as one is lost.

That these two sides [i.e., immediacy and mediation] . . . attain *reciprocal independence*—this must be considered *disease* . . . Just like *bodily* disease consists of the firming up of one organ or system against the general harmony of individual life . . . [so that] the particular activity of one system . . . becomes a proliferating growth, so also in the *life of the soul* disease happens when what . . . is the merely *soul-like*, becoming independent of the power of *spirit's* consciousness, arrogates to itself the latter's function, and spirit . . . sinks into the form of soul. (*Enc* §406 Zus)

In view of widely influential interpretations of mental disease inspired by Foucauldian sociology, it is worth remarking at this juncture that for Hegel (as for Pinel), dramatic self-alienation or mind-diremption is a source of

deep suffering in the affected individual (see *Enc* §408 Anm and Zus). It is the foundation of the dismal human conditions of depression, melancholia, distress, or frenzy that inevitably accompany, Hegel points out, authentic madness. In so-called posthumanistic theorizing, by contrast, the negative dimension of human psychopathologies is sometimes strikingly undervalued. Foucault famously prefers to highlight psychopathology's alleged antiestablishment potential, as if the behavioral energy arising from psychopathologies could be classified as a case of rebellious "freedom of expression." Despite many valuable psychological and sociological insights, Foucault's radical criticism of the revolutionary psychiatry of the 1790s in the *Histoire de la folie*¹⁴ overlooks its crucial, emancipatory historical role. It was precisely this movement that pioneered the political, personal, and legal protections of asylum inmates against established practices of neglect, maltreatment, and interdiction. For example, in his "Mémorial sur la Folie," first published on December 11, 1794,¹⁵ Pinel argues, among much else of great value, that, based on his experience, religiously motivated terrors and other manias are best confronted with medically informed and psychologically sensitive attention to the patient rather than with corporeal punishment, social contempt, or church-sanctioned exorcism—the entrenched techniques of the ancien régime. Yet Foucault brands the entire modern history of psychiatry a "monologue of reason" directed against the alleged lack of reason of the insane, whose "authentic voice" he compares with "the poetry of the world" (Foucault 1961, chap. 9). As shown below, neither Pinel nor Kant or Hegel considered madness to be simply a lack of reason, but rather the expression of a struggle of reason with itself as "unreason." In the face of historical documentation, Foucault's widely popular reconstruction of the history of psychiatry appears as a somewhat grotesque simplification of a complex and multifaceted development. It is true that the scientific and institutional history of psychiatry began and developed in the context of obscurantistic theories and practices; but, to use a Hegelian term, it did so precisely as a *Befreiungskampf* (liberation struggle) against obscurantism. What Foucauldianism often hails as the defense of the "voiceless" may even betray an underlying theoretical cynicism. Its reconstruction of psychiatry's history conceals the fact that despite the Enlighteners' narrow medical cognitions and simplistic therapies, they aspired to grasp human insanity in the broader context of humanity's political life and its (Aristotelian) telos: happiness. Hence, they did not hesitate to extend human rights protection to the inmates of lunatic asylums (among others) and to make this recognition of human rights an integral part of the "cure," thereby even experiencing some success in restoring patients to society. Paradoxically, posthumanist historiography tends to suppress precisely the political dimension of psychiatric research and criminal reform in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that it intends to bring to the fore. It ignores the radicalism, depth, and moral motivation of European revolutionaries' break with their own past. More importantly, it is

frequently nonchalant about the personal price that individuals pay for living with insanity—the price that humanists like Kant, Pinel, and Hegel have no difficulty locating in the sadness, distress, and anguish that accompany human beings who live in perpetual contradiction with themselves.

3. Out-of-Joint Times and Inner Derangement

Hegel thinks that classifications of types of derangement based on the phenotypal observation of symptoms and behaviors are not just philosophically unsatisfactory, but even of little value to medical etiology itself. Real clinical presentations and perceived erratic behaviors can only be explained, Hegel thinks, in terms that account for their internal logic and even their historical determinants.

The first step lies in distinguishing innate dispositions and transitory behaviors that only resemble insanity, from forms of insanity proper. This is best done against the backdrop of a definition of “sanity,” *Besonnenheit*. The sane individual is aware and capable of holding in herself her inward and outward worlds *as well as* their discrepancies. There are also borderline conditions, discussed in previous sections, in which the sane do handle the discrepancies in peculiar ways: in somnambulism or in a “magnetized” state (hypnosis), a healthy individual may for example suppress, through a transient loss of memory, her accustomed cognitions and behaviors. On the other hand, a somewhat disturbed individual who is still cognizant of herself as a unity of differences is nonetheless unable to fully control this inner tension. This individual cannot live at peace with her inner complexity. In the extreme case of the properly so-called deranged individual, the contradiction cannot be sustained at all. Self-opposition appears to be for the insane (that is, in her self-perception) no longer a mere matter of discrepancy between two perspectives on one and the same reality, but rather the intolerable, parallel coexistence of two irreconcilable realities.

The difference between the hypnotized, somnambulist, or unborn soul on the one hand, and the insane soul on the other, may seem to be a matter of degree but is in fact a radical difference: while “a double being-there [*ein zwiefaches Dasein*]” is integral to every living individuality, “an actual double [*ein wirklich Zwiefaches*]” (*Enc* §406 Zus) only affects the deranged. To them alone do subjective feeling and objective reality appear to be sundered from one another while being also of equal status.

The inception of mental imbalance can be detected when one’s feeling soul begins to camouflage as external objectivity on a par with the objects of conscious experience. It is then that my feelings about my social status, needs, purposes, erotic desires, gods, or enemies become for me objective knowledge of the world. I no longer compare inner and outer worlds, nor do I judge my feelings through my consciousness. Whatever activity of judgment (*Urteil*)

remains in me, it no longer consists of the subordination of one dimension of myself to another, but of a complete uncoupling (*Urteilung*) of the two. My self-feeling has now established a unique world order, valid at first for myself but eventually to be enforced on all others who participate, or ought to participate, in it. The individual in the throes of insanity becomes incapable of situating herself in the existing ethical life in which she used to operate. The pervasive portrayal of types of insanity as types of disorder by Hegel and his contemporaries is, of course, only meaningful in juxtaposition with a presupposed existing order. While this cannot be discussed further in this context, it is worth remarking that this conceptualization of insanity lives on unaltered in today's standard vocabulary of "mental disorders."

In §408 Hegel begins by combining the themes from the four sections just discussed. A deranged individual is one who, despite having attained the stage of consciousness, is no longer able to make her feelings and self-feeling compatible with conscious contents and self-consciousness. This is an individual locked in an apparently irresolvable tension between particular selfness and universal selfhood. Furthermore, these two self-referential ways of being are not ordered in the hierarchical fashion in which they are arranged in the sane individual, namely, by subordination of the particular feeling of self to universal consciousness. Rather, the two dimensions of this personality play the role of two rank-equal *Genii* caught in a power struggle. If this is unresolved, the one individual becomes two persons. In contrast to somnambulism, Hegel writes,

in *authentic derangement* [*in der eigentlichen Verrücktheit*], the *two personalities are not two conditions*, but exist in *one and the same condition*, so that these mutually *negative* personalities—the one that is soul-like and the understanding consciousness—*touch each other and know of one another*. (*Enc* §408 Zus)

In Hegel's view, therefore, full-blown derangement, no matter what its pathological expressions are, is characterized by the presence of a radical form of what we would now call schizophrenia. Hegel's term is *Katatonie*, then widely used to name behaviors ascribed to the kind of real—not perspectival—mind-duality he is attempting to define here: the German term *Schizophrenie* (a compound of two Greek words to designate a "split mind") did not yet exist in the psychiatric vocabulary of Hegel's time. *Schizophrenie* was first used by the psychiatrist Eugen Bleuler (1857–1939) to specify kinds of mental decline that until then had been collected under the catchall term "dementia praecox."¹⁶ Contemporary psychiatry does not stray far from these nineteenth- and early twentieth-century classifications: "catatonia" is still used to group together different symptoms otherwise classified as schizophrenic, depressive, or bipolar. The official and generic term "schizophrenia" is employed for a wide variety of syndromes, only one of which earns the

name of “schizophrenia proper.”¹⁷ The radical dichotomy of existence (*das zwiefache Dasein*) at the core of Hegel’s analysis appears to still be the conceptual basis of contemporary terms like “split personality” or “dissociative identity.” In Hegel’s conception, the consequence of this pivotal feature of authentic derangement is that the affected subject can neither forget what she consciously knows when her inward feeling overcomes her consciousness, nor escape from her inward feeling when consciousness provides her with contrary evidence. Though in-itself one, the deranged person is for-itself two:

The deranged subject is therefore *by itself* in the *negative of itself*; . . . the twofold entity into which it disaggregates is not brought to *unity*. Hence, though *in-itself* one and the same subject, the objective self-reference of the deranged is not a reference to one coinciding with himself, one inwardly undivided, but to one breaking up into *two personalities*. (Enc §408 Zus)

Before reviewing some of the details of Hegel’s taxonomy, one should note that his characterization of insanity as a withdrawal from objectivity into radical subjectivism has important ethical ramifications in his political philosophy. It plays a major role in the critical dissection of public (or political) as opposed to private agency in the *Philosophy of Right*’s middle section entitled “Morality.” Here Hegel diagnoses public figures’ justification of their actions through the alleged moral authenticity they attain by searching their conscience (*Gewissen*), rather than by following right (*Recht*), as a breeding ground for criminal political deeds. Justifications based on the private sanctuary of one’s moral feeling can be used to validate right and wrong actions equally. Following almost to the letter Kant’s critique of “pseudopolitics” in the two “Appendixes” to “Perpetual Peace” (Kant 1969g), Hegel argues that this moralistic justificationism is the paradigm case of hypocrisy in that it appeals to the “bottomless pit” of individual conscience. By definition, this inscrutable reality can contain no knowledge of, and engender no obligation to, existing right. In reality, says Hegel, conscience’s allegedly unique authenticity “consists simply of being on the verge of *evil*” (*RPh* §139 Anm). This is because there is no inherent natural drive toward the good or, for that matter, toward evil. By itself, the natural will is not disposed to either. The good can only be an object for the free will, and the free will is neither an offspring of feeling (contrary to Romantic convictions) nor of individual conscience (contrary to Protestant persuasion). The good is an offspring of reason, the result of the rational will’s “own labor” (*RPh* §131 Zus). An individual action’s worth can only be assessed over against existing right, because where there is no positive existence—as in the impenetrable depths of individual conscience—there can be no determining what the object of knowledge is, or what the end of action ought to be. In other words, where ethical laws are silent, every action and its moral opposite are justifiable. The

parallelism between this line of argument in the *Philosophy of Right* and the analysis of genuine madness in the *Anthropology* is striking: the withdrawal from consciousness of objectivity is common to both the moralistic “pseudopolitician” and the insane. In both cases, the actions resulting from this withdrawal are as often evil as they are good. The appeal to some inaccessible recesses of intuitive wisdom, to inspired foresight, or to deeply held benevolence on the part of public figures is the hypocritical version of the insane individuals’ guileless fixation on the private world of their feelings. In a Remark, Hegel notes:

Whether what conscience *takes* or pronounces *to be good* is actually good can be ascertained only from the *content* of this supposed good. What is right and duty is . . . neither the *particular* possession of an individual, nor does it have the *form* of feeling . . . but the form of *universal* thought determinations, i.e., . . . of laws and principles. (RPh §137 Anm)

The breeding ground of unethical politics is for Hegel a political kind of schizophrenia: the diremption between the politician’s knowledge and his will. The political hypocrite knows the right but does not will it as his end. He becomes a “majestic despot” who, not unlike the deranged individual, “*evaporates . . . all determinacy* of rights, duties, and realities in himself” (RPh §138). The political despot embodies radical subjectivism combined with absolute power, emulating the insane except for the fact that the latter, while embodying radical subjectivism, combines it with the *delusion* of absolute power. Finally, in a marginal note to his discussion of criminal infringements of human right by political actors who justify themselves through appeals to their moral intuitions, Hegel compares such appeals to conscience with a social “disease”: the combination of radical subjectivism with power (what the twentieth century would eventually call “decisionism”) is, Hegel says, “the principal standpoint and disease of this our time” (RPh §138).¹⁸

As for the individual soul’s genuine maladies, Hegel calls the self-referential nature of the deranged a “sinking-into-self,” *Insichversunkensein* (Enc §408 Zus). Depending on the kind of contents these individuals sink into (those they claim to find in the bottomless pit of their feeling self), this withdrawal may happen in a number of ways. These define the principal types of derangement that provide the basic taxonomy in Hegel’s Addition on madness.

First (αα),¹⁹ the individual soul may retreat into a largely empty selfness. This is called “weak-spiritedness” (*Geistesschwäche*). Second (ββ), the soul may withdraw by concentrating on one single content of its selfness. This is “manic folly” (*Narrheit*). Third (γγ), the soul’s exclusive object of attention may become the very diremption between its felt selfness and its conscious selfhood. In Hegel’s taxonomy, only the latter form of withdrawal from the world deserves the name of insanity in the full sense: *Tollheit* or *Wahnsinn*.

Standard contemporary typology, as reflected, for example, in the current edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5), parallels Hegel's systematics by classifying three principal categories of only partially overlapping disorders: "neurodevelopmental disorders," "schizophrenia spectrum" disorders, and "bipolarism." This parallelism is all the more striking in view of the avowed methodology of contemporary psychiatry, namely, to obtain classifications through induction from the observation and statistical analysis of symptoms and behaviors. "Speculative" methods like Hegel's deduction of insanity from the psyche's self-sundering, and the correlation of disease types with kinds of withdrawal into self-feeling, are the farthest from official psychiatry's avowed methodology. Given contemporary nosologies, however, it seems that Hegel's metaphysical assumptions about the soul as a process of serial self-diremptions making individuals vulnerable to pathological forms of "schizophrenia" may well be inadvertently presupposed in today's official typologies.

To begin with the disorders of weak-spiritedness (*aa*, for which Hegel has no technical designation, since *Geistesschwäche* is a common word), these encompass conditions in which the subject's mind is either under- or over-determined by objectivity. The subtypes Hegel lists—imbecility (*Blödsinn*), absent-mindedness (*Zerstreuung*), and rambling (*Fasellei*)—parallel the contemporary classification of a variety of pathological conditions under the umbrella term "neurodevelopmental disorders." Under this title, the DSM-5 treats various intellectual disabilities, autism, learning and motor disorders, and attention deficit—in a word, syndromes of mental under- or overstimulation (see American Psychiatric Association 2013, 31–86). It is essential to note that none of these conditions are, in Hegel's understanding, forms of genuine insanity. Among other sources, Hegel relies in part on Kant's largely Rousseauian account (in his 1764 "Essay on the Maladies of the Head") of disorders that are not definable as types of madness. Some of these, according to Kant, are fostered, mocked, or exploited by civil society's unnatural pressures and moral perversions; other kinds of weak-spiritedness, he adds, are instead recognized in civil society for what they are, and are deemed worthy of care (see Kant 1969e, 257–71). Prominent among the forms of weak-spiritedness unfortunately nurtured in this kind of society, Kant also observes, is the pathological duplicity or hypocrisy characteristic of members of this modern form of life—a phenomenon Hegel would revisit, as shown above, in the *Philosophy of Right*.

In Hegel's taxonomy of weak-spiritedness, "imbecility" is the prototype of mental underdetermination. It may be inborn, acquired, or self-inflicted. When inborn, it is commonly referred to as "cretinism." But weak-spiritedness may also be the result of traumatic injuries or of seizures. Finally, it may also be self-inflicted through one's "intemperate lifestyle." Its manifestations include cases of "catalepsy," a type of "hysteria" causing "organ paralysis," and even those pathological forms of melancholia already mentioned in the Addition

to §406, which Hegel believes to be rampant in England. The second variation of weak-spiritedness is “absent-mindedness,” an either transitory or lifelong detachment from the external world. Hegel refers to this condition as *wissenlose Ungegenwart des Geistes*—literally an “unknowing lack of presence of spirit” (*Enc* §408 Zus) that indicates either incipient madness or the presence of genius—both extremes to be found prominently among scholars. The last distinct form of weak-spiritedness, “rambling” (Petry uses the word “desipience”), is the counterpart of absent-mindedness and the paradigm of mental overdetermination. The individual directs her attention at everything and focuses on nothing. The rambler is the “image of chaos,” but only in the most severe cases does the rambler’s lack of focus prompt an “unconscious reversal [*bewusstlose Verkehrung*]” (*Enc* §408 Zus) of real-world connections. This is then what earns the name of “delirium.”

Derangement in its second form (ßß) as manic folly or folly proper (*eigentliche Narrheit*) indicates a concentration of all mental activities on one singular content of the feeling soul, so that this content is turned into an obsessive idea (literally, a “fixed representation,” or *fixe Vorstellung*), often accompanied by the compulsion to reify this idea. The feeling self is here overdetermined by one all-consuming content. Remarkably, Hegel’s discussion comprises the entire slate of “delusions” (defined as fixed beliefs not easily amenable to change in the light of evidence) recognized in today’s official classifications: persecutory, self-referential, grandiose, nihilistic, and somatic delusions (American Psychiatric Association 2013, 87). Early symptoms of folly can be discerned, according to Hegel, in common human passions that have become unrestrained, mainly excessive vanity (*Eitelkeit*) and uninhibited pride (*Hochmut*), phenomena that he does not hesitate to describe as compensatory mechanisms for a pervasive dissatisfaction with life. Even these notions of pathological vanity and pride are reflected in today’s psychiatric terminology: “inflated self-esteem” and “delusional grandiosity” are identified as manifestations of the manic phase in bipolarism (see American Psychiatric Association 2013, 123–27), as well as in certain cases of schizophrenia.

Folly displays a wide range of degrees, from small-mindedness and cultural parochialism, to hostility against life in general, to manic obsession—the latter being a source of acute suffering. The fool displays enormous energy in holding onto her mental object. Yet even at the height of irrationality she is a being of reason, that is, a being aware of the discrepancy between reality and her singular obsession: “Fools possess therefore, along with their distortion in regard to one point, also a good, coherent consciousness, a correct take on things and the capacity for rational [*verständlich*] agency” (*Enc* §408 Zus).

The common ground of folly’s main subtypes, life tedium (*Lebensüberdruß*) and melancholy (*Melancholie*), is a deep-seated repugnance for life (*Ekel am Leben*). If prompted by personal loss or the collapse of one’s social world, these forms of folly must be considered reasonable, and even

rational, responses to reality. Only extreme unsociability and unrelenting gloom may turn into full-scale irrationality and lead to what Hegel dubs the ultimate folly, suicide. But from the same grounds that generate this misery may equally spring its counterpart, the exhilarating passion displayed by some fools for the object of their fixation—which is exactly the “excessive euphoria” (American Psychiatric Association 2013, 127) recognized by contemporary psychiatry as the principal manifestation of the manic phase in bipolarism. As was the case for Enlightenment thinkers, for Hegel, too, religious beliefs and political ideologies are particularly fertile grounds for fools’ passionate obsessions: some believe themselves “*God, Christ, or King*” (*Enc* §408 Zus); and in the wake of French imperial conquests, many fancied themselves to be Napoleon.

Only in the most radical form of derangement, madness proper (γγ: *Wahnsinn*), does the individual come face to face with self-alienation, the most radical diremption of one’s identity into two persons. The madman, unable to give up the feeling world that has come to dominate him, is nonetheless cognizant of the confining, delusional subjectivism of this interior world—and suffers from this knowledge. What is of particular interest in Hegel’s account of *Wahnsinn* is his search for the ultimate grounds of this extraordinary human condition.

In contrast to contemporary official etiologies of psychopathologies, in which the social and historical grounds for human derangement play at best a subsidiary role (when they are not simply being paid lip service as generic “psychosocial stressors”), the etiologies offered by Pinel and Hegel take seriously the role of institutional, economic, and juridical breakdowns on individuals’ mental stability. For Pinel and Hegel, historical watersheds can be the real grounds of radical reversals in individuals’ perception and understanding of themselves and reality. Ever since the studies of “hysteria” by Jean-Martin Charcot and his student Pierre Janet, which culminated in Joseph Breuer and Sigmund Freud’s coauthored *Studies on Hysteria* (1893), these reversals observed in previously balanced and well-adjusted subjects have been called “traumas.” Until very recently, however, these have been typically understood as events in the private lives of individuals—in the case of Breuer’s and Freud’s studies, mostly as sexually charged occurrences in the discreet seclusion of the nuclear family. This central European bourgeois perspective is now being gradually broadened by new trauma research (e.g., Ringel and Brandell 2012). Despite its renewed narrow emphasis (this time, on the specific context of the North American continent), and despite its questionable claim to be opening an entirely new terrain in the investigation of the traumatized psyche, this research revives a crucial insight of Enlightenment psychiatry that had been largely suppressed in the intervening century:

Although there has been much scholarship devoted to the study of trauma, the field has expanded rapidly . . . From an earlier focus

on the interpersonal aspects of trauma, including child abuse and domestic violence, traumatic experiences have taken on political and social dimensions, for example, the events of 9/11, the war on terror, . . . combat trauma associated with . . . wars in Afghanistan and Iraq . . . finally, the rash of school shootings in American public schools . . . These complex social and political phenomena have added to the magnitude of traumatic experiences in everyday life. (Ringel and Brandell 2012, 10)

It is precisely the attention paid to the large-scale, historical dimensions of profound psychopathologies (minus the narrow national focus transpiring from the examples in the quoted passage) that characterizes Hegel's thinking about the primary motive forces of genuine derangement. This is neither an idiosyncratic nor an entirely original choice of explanation on his part. Kant took the connection between the individual psyche and society largely for granted; and Pinel made the link between mental crisis and the breakdown of social structures explicit at every turn. Based on Hegel's analysis of the soul's dynamics, if the structures of ethical life indeed reach like roots into the *Genius* or core personality of the individual, then the collapse of those structures might well have a seismic effect on the soul. The objective world disclosed by consciousness is not an add-on to the subjective dimension of the human soul. That objective world is the human soul's content and existential import to begin with. Examining the cataclysmic effects of historical upheavals on the individual soul is for Hegel a cornerstone of the attempt to rationally comprehend human insanity.²⁰

Accordingly, although the types of factors that trigger insanity may be many, the ground of radical derangement (which for Hegel includes types of criminal insanity) must be sought in the breakup of the madman's ethical world. Just as little as genuine madness originates in a realm of "confused ideas," so madness is also not confined to the sphere of private relations. Its deepest sources are historical traumas:

In the concept of derangement just given is contained [the implication] that derangement does not need to spring from an *empty figment*, but may be brought about especially by the impact of a *great misfortune*, through the *displacement* [Verrückung] of the individual world of a person, or through the *violent inversion* and unraveling of the general state of the world . . . In this way, for example, in the French revolution many people have become deranged through the subversion of almost all civil conditions [*bürgerliche Verhältnisse*]. (Enc §408 Zus)²¹

In 1807, in the lingering shadow of the events triggered by the revolutionary Committee of Public Safety in France, Hegel had already described the

“terror of negativity” unleashed by a political agent under extreme conditions as a form of radical withdrawal into an abstract self:

[In] absolute freedom there was no interaction between a consciousness steeped in the manifold of reality [*Dasein*], or setting its own determinate ends, . . . and a valid *external* world, . . . but [there was only] the world purely and simply in the form of consciousness, as universal will, and equally self-consciousness withdrawn from all . . . reality . . . into the simple self. (*PhenG* W 3:439)

Thirteen years later, in the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Hegel makes a more general point of this: “to uphold abstractions in actuality is tantamount to destroying actuality” (*GeschPh* W 20:331–32). And in the context of a discussion of the “abstractions” of Islamic religion in the *Philosophy of History*, Hegel draws the same connection between ideological abstractness, monomaniacal fixation, social reality, and terror:

Fanaticism . . . [is] enthusiasm for . . . an abstract thought that relates to what exists by negating it. Fanaticism exists essentially only by relating to the concrete by devastation, by destruction . . . *La religion et la terreur* was the principle here, just like *la liberté et la terreur* for Robespierre. (*PhGesch* W 12:431)²²

The *Anthropology* describes the madman in pretty much the same words: “the deranged subject . . . is not able to let go of this [merely subjective] representation; instead, he wants to make it actual or to annihilate actuality” (*Enc* §408 Zus). The historical link between real or delusional despotic power, criminal violence, and derangement is well attested; all that Hegel does is illuminate this link by deciphering the pattern of action common to the political despot and the private madman. The urge of the despot to reify abstract ideologies in the body politic parallels the urge of the madman to somaticize abstract representations in the organic body. Both endeavors result in the destruction of reality—one’s own and everyone else’s.

Even particular religious practices, which would normally be classified by Hegel as cases of plain folly, may become authentic *Wahn* (proper madness) when they involve, for example, the abuse of the body: Hegel counts burdensome pilgrimages and extreme forms of asceticism in Hinduism and Christianity among such cases of authentic derangement. Writing on *l’aliénation mentale*, Philippe Pinel had already remarked: “Nothing is more atrocious and savage than the somber dreams and fanatical madness of an atrabilious worshiper” (Pinel 1992, 730).

Beyond connecting individual insanity to social disorder, Hegel focuses on another, not unrelated aspect of insanity, namely, its coexistence with reason. Even this facet of madness had been brought to the fore by both Kant and

Pinel: in order for the internal oppositions of the deranged individual to arise at all, her urges and actions must clash with her still active reasoning powers. Indeed, in his essay on the illnesses “of the head,” Kant refers to degrees of mental weakness as “inverted reason,” “shackled reason,” and “disordered reason,” respectively (Kant 1969e, 260). Thirty years later, Pinel’s “Memoir on Madness” refers to delirious mania and melancholy as syndromes of “alienated reason,” and to therapy as a restoration of “deranged reason” (Pinel 1992, 728 and 730). Were reason to be altogether absent, we would be in the presence of weak-spiritedness, but not of madness. This is the background of Hegel’s own definition of aggressive forms of derangement as manifestations of the reciprocal “*fury of reason against unreason* [Wut der Vernunft gegen die Unvernunft]” (Enc §408 Zus). For example, he explains a hypochondriac’s abrupt change from quiet pain (Pinel’s *manie sans delire*) to rage (*manie avec delire*) and back as resulting from the reciprocal repugnance of reason and unreason in one and the same subject. Tortured by the figments of his imagination, the hypochondriac creates for himself an ethical world that reproduces these and tries to have them dominate or even replace the ethical world he still shares with others. In the case of the criminally insane, inner fury may express itself as outer ferocity, fully unleashing “the sinister subterranean forces of the heart” (Enc §408 Zus). And yet, since this extreme degree of insanity is still a conflict of unreason *with reason*, even in this case Hegel fully follows Pinel’s view that the iniquity of the criminally insane does not obliterate their rational moral nature. From this follows the theoretical possibility that all forms of authentic derangement may in principle be healed. (Varieties of weak-mindedness are excluded from this healing, since they are not forms of derangement.) Furthermore, since the soul’s ontological status is hylomorphic, therapies only have a chance of success if they are “part *physical*, part *mental*.” Hegel concludes that “one thing is certain,” namely, that the purely physical therapies formerly performed in nefarious asylums like Bedlam are “the worst of all” (Enc §408 Zus). Well into the eighteenth century, the “treatment” of the insane in London’s Bethlehem asylum (founded six centuries earlier) was exclusively corporeal. This included cold hydrotherapy (regarded as anti-inflammatory), purging, bleeding, and the rationing of food (a simple enough device for weakening violent patients’ energy while also balancing the institution’s budget). During Hegel’s time, British parliamentary inquiries on the conditions in the asylum were ongoing, and Bedlam physicians struggled to defend both their personal reputations and the time-hallowed institutional status quo against public denunciations by Quakers and other committed reformers.²³

The most eloquent illustration of Hegel’s notion of an intimate relation between mental and world disorders is not found, however, in the hearsay or even the documented cases (collected in the Addition to §408) that he gathers from contemporaneous psychiatric and journalistic works. Rather, his viewpoint finds a most forceful paragon in the *Lectures on Aesthetics*.²⁴

While referencing Goethe's interpretation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Hegel describes the Danish prince as obsessed with the misapprehension of himself as the lone individual called to singlehandedly restore rightfulness in an ethically dismembered world in which he no longer finds himself reflected. The profound connection between objective disarray and subjective derangement is captured in Hamlet's words "The time is out of joint; O cursed spite, That ever I was born to set it right!" (*Hamlet*, act 1, scene 5).

A major theme running through the *Aesthetics'* discussion of the poetic arts is that of the discrepancy between ancient and modern tragedy. While ancient heroes clash with the requirements of existing ethical life and perish as a consequence of this conflict, modern heroes tend to clash with themselves—and perish as a consequence of this auto-antagonism. Contrary to figures like Oedipus or Antigone, Hegel argues, figures like Hamlet "are double human beings [*gedoppelte Menschen*] who cannot attain a settled and hence firm individuality" (*Aesth III W 15:563*). In the Shakespearean tragedy, "the authentic clash consists . . . not in the son having to violate ethicality itself in his ethical vengeance, but only in the subjective character of Hamlet, whose noble soul is . . . full of revulsion against the world and life" (*Aesth III W 15:559*).

Already in the first volume of the *Lectures on Aesthetics*, which is dedicated to the general concept and the particular forms of "the beautiful" in art, Hegel pictures the Danish Prince as being in perpetual inner discord and simultaneously maniacally fixated on the world of his feelings, which are referred to here, as in the *Anthropology*, as a presentiment or intuition (*Ahnung*) of the real situation at the Danish court. Intense distrust of others and a panicky fear of imminent danger best describe Hamlet's predominant outlook. From the onset, Hegel writes, Hamlet senses that something uncanny, "something monstrous must have happened" (*Aesth I W 13:300*), of which there is, however, no tangible evidence. After the disclosure made by the deceased king—and a ghost, by definition, is an inner vision—one would expect the son to carry out retribution without further ado. But Hamlet is incapable of carrying out any action: he is "a beautiful soul pulled inward, . . . melancholy, gloomy, hypochondriac and brooding" (*Aesth I W 13:300*). His hesitancy does not flow from prudence, skepticism, calculation, or strategy. It is a pathological reluctance, a catatonic inability to act. While adamantly convinced that he alone can remedy the calamity that has befallen the kingdom, his *Genius* does not let him take action. His subjective errors and feelings of guilt are brought about by the objective ethical disorder of his world.

In order to capture Hamlet's inner tragedy, Hegel uses the terminology he employs in the *Anthropology* to define "manic depression" (another nineteenth-century term that is still in wide contemporary use: see American Psychiatric Association 2013, 123). The prince, we read, is "a lost man . . . consumed by weariness within even before death approaches him from

without" (*Aesth III W 15:567*). Hegel is not inclined to interpret Shakespearean tragedies primarily through the psychiatric lens, but his description of Hamlet's behavior, which he develops in terms borrowed from the psychiatric vocabulary of his time, sheds a powerful light on his conception of persecutory delusions, catatonic depression, and the suffering that accompanies them. Beyond the descriptive analysis, Hegel's specification of the origins and ultimate causes of Hamlet's curse makes it fully explicit that he understands the individual soul to be intimately connected with the reality to which it inescapably belongs. While *the triggers* of Hamlet's unease may lie in the idiosyncrasies of his personality, and perhaps in the confluence of disposition, temperament, and character in his personal *daimon*, *the roots* of his soul's tragic disorder lie in the breakup of his ethical world: the spirit of his time, rendered "out of joint."

Conclusion



Inhabiting the World, or *die Gewohnheit*

According to its *immediate* existence, the human being is to itself a natural being . . . ; only through the *development* of its own body and spirit . . . does the human being take possession of itself.

—Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, §57

1. Spirit Builds Itself a Home

The expansion of the notion of *phusis* to include peculiarly human features, capacities, and activities not shared by the rest of the natural world, and produced through habituation, education, or training is already documented among the pre-Socratics. Democritus, for example, is said to have coined the term *phusiopoiein*, “to make nature” (Diels-Kranz 1903, 68 B33), in order to refer to the transformational powers of education. In Stoic ethics, the principal object of human wisdom is the learning of the *technē* (craft or art) of life and is carried out by exercising our distinct capacity for reason; hence, for humans to live according to the rationality inherent in nature means for them to exert and train themselves, which is the very opposite of a passive acquiescence to nature’s ways. In the *Gorgias*, Plato seems to prefer to err on the side of first nature with regard to the question of the origin of human law. But the dialogue does entertain the possibility of a second nature, born of convention and yet as authoritative as first nature. It would fall to Aristotle, especially in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, to move habit formation to center stage in accounting for our capacity for ethical life. The importance of habituation even leads Aristotle to formulate something akin to the concept of a second nature: “The reason why habit is also difficult to change is that it is like nature, as Euenus says, ‘Habit, my friend, is longtime training, and in the end training is *nature* for human beings’” (NE 1152a31–34; my emphasis). Ancient medical treatises stressed the importance of habit formation as a kind of “naturalization” of activities to counter illnesses brought on by first nature. In his work

“On Habit,” Galen (following long-established Hippocratic wisdom) writes that features acquired from sustained habituation become “like” natural properties. Attempting to counter popular conceptions of pleasure-seeking in Roman circles, Cicero explicitly attributes to Greek philosophers the notion of an “other” nature born from habit that enables human beings to circumvent the dictates of first nature: “Even the very proponents of hedonism . . . declare that pleasure is only desired initially. Subsequently, habit creates a kind of second nature, which drives people to do many things that do not include seeking pleasure” (*On Moral Ends*, book V, chapter 74). In addition to its power to modify inward propensities and capacities, and in analogy to the Stoic conception of a “craftsmanlike” nature of the cosmos, second nature also includes for Cicero the production of a nearly novel external world (*quasi altera natura*) brought about by habitual and purposeful exertion or work.

Contemporary classical scholarship¹ points out that ancient conceptions of *deutera* or *hetera phusis* by and large amount to an expansion of the concept of first nature. They do not imply a parting from it. It is only in modern philosophy that the concept of “second nature” becomes radicalized, at times assuming as it were a curious sort of ontological independence.²

In treating habit and habituation (*Enc* §§409–12), Hegel is engaging this tradition by framing it in the third moment of the feeling soul: no longer only related immediately to its sensations (b. α) or mediately to its felt selfness (b. β), the soul has now become the master-unifier of its own immediacy and mediation (b. γ). This is the last stage at which natural spirit is substantially beholden to nature. All that is achievable to natural spirit—or, as in the formulation of §388, to spirit that is “not yet spirit”³—has been achieved. In the end, spirit-as-soul must yield to spirit *sans phrase*, whose phenomenal manifestations provide the subject matter of the next division of *Subjective Spirit*, the “Phenomenology.” The title “The actual soul” that comprises both concluding sections of the *Anthropology* (§§411–12) denotes both the full actualization of natural spirit and the exhaustion of its powers.

Hegel uses the term “habit”—*Gewohnheit*, literally, “(in)habitation”—at two distinct semantic levels, the individual and the anthropological. The first level involves the well-known activities by which already acculturated human beings train themselves and their fellow humans to the physical and intellectual practices that sustain their culture. Here, a kind of subordination to natural mechanism or a pedagogical dependence on others’ skill and knowledge are central connotations of habit. This type of habit formation is shared, albeit at much lower levels of complexity, by other animal species. Therefore, it has weak explanatory power with regard to the specifically human condition. The second, philosophically more relevant, meaning of “habit” refers to the process, unique in the animal kingdom, by which our species transitions from the natural to the cultured life, from natural cycles to human history.

The specifically anthropological meaning of “habit” refers therefore to the species’ production of its own *historical nature*. In this usage, habit formation necessarily means self-habituating, just as Rousseau’s use of the word “domestication,” which normally denotes the adaptation of animals to the human world, can only apply to humanity if intended as “self-domestication.” The principal meaning of *Gewohnheit* in Hegel’s *Anthropology* must be understood as referring to the self-conditioning of humanity in the transitional process from *anthropos* to *Mensch*.

What makes this transition possible is precisely the human species’ capacity to “posit” (*setzen*) purposes that are not first-nature ends. Hegel identifies the ground of this capacity straightforwardly in the metaphysical makeup or “concept” of the soul:

The soul cannot rest in . . . immediate unity with its body. The form of immediacy of that harmony *contradicts the concept of the soul*—[namely,] its being destined to be self-relating ideality. In order to become adequate to this . . . concept, *the soul . . . must make its identity with its body into a posited or mediated one*, . . . reshaping it so as to self-relate in it, making it into an accident . . . in tune with its substance, freedom. The body is the medium through which I meet up with the external world. (*Enc* §410 Zus; emphases added)

In contrast to the rhythms, cycles, mechanisms, and chemisms in which the sentient and feeling soul participates, the processes and results of habit formation are unnatural. Of course, in the taming and training of animals we also form their bodily and psychic competencies well beyond what first nature intended. Yet in the training of animals, the goals of habit development are not theirs. They are human goals. By contrast, the production of our own ways of life—the becoming of the political animal—is an imposition on ourselves, a second-order naturalization of our own purposes: “habit has been rightfully called a second nature—*nature*, insofar as it is an immediate being of the soul—and a *second* one, because it is an immediacy *posited* by the soul, an inner and pervasive shaping [*Ein- und Durchbildung*] of corporeity” (*Enc* §410 Anm).

The soul’s “positing” of second nature is the equivalent of what Hegel elsewhere calls the activity of the “natural will.” In these last passages of the *Anthropology* he asserts, for example, that our species’ erect stance results from the “energy of the will”; that the human hand is an adaptation to the “expressions of the will”; and that habit is a “voluntary” incorporation of spirit’s goals (*Enc* §411 Zus). None of these references to the will ought to be mistaken as references to the free and conscious will of the *Philosophy of Right*—either in its abstractly juridical or in its more concrete ethical incarnations. In these closing paragraphs of the *Anthropology*, “the will” refers to a liberating drive but not yet to a will that is itself free. This natural will is

discussed and illustrated, in a direct reference to its anthropological role, in the introduction to the *Philosophy of Right*:

The will that is only will in concept is in-itself free but simultaneously also unfree, since it would be truly free only . . . in having freedom for its object . . . The child [e.g.] is . . . *in-itself* reason, the possibility of reason and freedom, hence free only in concept . . . The human being, which *in-itself* is rational, must work its way through the production of itself [*Produktion seiner selbst*], by going beyond itself but also by building itself inwardly, so that it may become rational *for itself*. (*RPh* §10 Zus)

On the one hand, the objective of the natural will is liberation (*Befreiung*) from first nature, not the exercise of conscious freedom (*Freiheit*). On the other hand, these processes of self-liberation are “natural” only in a derivative way, namely, as *naturalizations* of unnatural, posited aims. Taken together, these naturalizations result in what philosophers have variously called the “other,” “second,” “artificial,” “conventional,” “domesticated,”⁴ or manmade nature.

Once the natural history of its formation is completed, humanity alone among animal types posits itself and endeavors to sustain itself as a species whose nature is henceforth codetermined by history:

The *involuntary* embodiment of inner sensations⁵ . . . is something partly common to humans and animals. The embodiments we must now discuss, which occur with *freedom*, impress on the human body such a unique spiritual stamp that through it the human being differentiates itself from animals far more than through any mere natural feature. (*Enc* §411 Zus)

No doubt having in mind the lively and at times bitter debate on the presence or absence of the intermaxillary bone in humans and other mammals—a debate⁶ involving most prominently Blumenbach, Buffon, Camper, and Goethe—Hegel insists on the following point: though the human species may not differ much from the great apes physically, the “saturation” (*Enc* §411 Zus) of human corporeity with spiritual capacities, purposes, and activities causes us to differ from the apes more than the apes differ from birds. Hegel proceeds to list various features of what one may call the “fluorescence” of the mind through a human body. Primary among these features are the human face, visage, or countenance (*das Gesicht*) and the play of its expressions (*das Mienenspiel*); human deportment (*die Haltung*), conspicuously chosen by ancient sculptors (rather than facial expression) to represent humanity’s divine nature; the decorous covering of bodily parts that are too reminiscent of our pure animality; the human hand “apt to serving an infinite

number of expressions of the will” (*Enc* §411 Zus); and bodily gestures (*die Gebärden*), among which the anatomically challenging erect posture is the most unequivocal, and possibly the first, expression of the natural will in humanity’s emergence from nature:⁷

The *absolute* gesture of the human being is the *upright stance* . . . The human being is not upright by nature, not originally; he straightens up through the energy of his will; and although his standing, once a habit, no longer needs any further effort of voluntary activity, still this standing must continue to be sustained by our will, lest we should sink down at once. (*Enc* §411 Zus)

The many threads of Hegel’s study of the natural basis and unnatural developments of subjective spirit come together in these sections. Habit’s tangible manifestations, which he illustrates with facts from physical anthropology and behavioral psychology, are the real touchstone of the truth of soul’s hylo-morphism, namely, its being a unity of organized matter and spirit. Indeed, if animal life in general can be fully explained only by postulating a materiality that dialectically includes “the universal immateriality of nature” (*Enc* §389),⁸ then in the case of the human animal we observe this dialectic, as it were, firsthand. The unity of the human animal consists of its capacity to virtualize bodily affections in mental representations, and further, to objectify mental representations in bodily skills and activities: “the *ideal* determinations of the soul obtain in habit the form of *something that exists*, a *self-externality*, and conversely corporeity becomes . . . saturated by the soul, subjected to the soul’s power of ideality that is being released”⁹ (*Enc* §411 Zus). In the human species, this twin process is just as often involuntary as it is voluntary. It is irreducible to the exercise of merely natural powers—an irreducibility Hegel has already addressed in the general introduction to the *Philosophy of Spirit* under the heading “Concept of spirit”:

The transition of nature to spirit is not a transition to something entirely other, but only a return to itself [*Zusichselberkommen*] of spirit, which, in nature, is external to itself. Just as little does this transition eliminate the . . . difference between nature and spirit, because spirit does not emerge from nature in a natural way . . . the emergence of spirit . . . is not of the flesh, but spiritual, . . . a development of the Concept. (*Enc* §381 Zus)

In this metaphysical conception, despite contrary *appearances* spirit’s emergence from nature is, first, a return to itself insofar as it is always already present in nature, albeit in the mode of exteriority. Second, spirit’s emergence from nature in no way obliterates its difference from the latter—just as little as externality and inwardness are “the same,” or the natural and spiritual

dimensions of the Idea cancel each another out. This principle is being applied here to anthropological subject matter: humanity's exiting from its purely animal condition is really a coming home, a gradual, laborious, drawn-out, historical self-habituating of *anthropos* to its true concept as *Mensch*. This self-habituating, we are told in these closing sections of the *Anthropology*, is the catalyst that ignites the human "I" and in so doing consumes the mere self-externality, the simple animality of being-human.

2. On Divine Sparks, Unnatural Freedom, and Other Human Matters

Throughout the evolution of the soul, the common pattern of its movement has been an incessant distinguishing itself from and reunifying itself with the environment and with its own affections. The pivotal movement at issue in the formation of the "actual soul" is an activity of constant distinguishing and reunifying of the soul's spiritual and corporeal dimensions. The result of this dynamics is a distinctively human subjectivity. Once this stage has been reached, the dominance of organic physicality over the spiritual dimension of the living individual undergoes a radical inversion: instead of a body possessing spirit, the realized human individual now exists as spirit possessing a body. Human corporeity is no longer the substantial bearer of subjectivity; rather, human subjectivity is now the substance that moves and sustains the body.

The reality of a species that has moved beyond mere animal subjectivity makes itself known in the abilities, dexterity, and skills of the craftsman and the scientist, the workman and the artist, the reader, writer, and dancer. In their activities the body, in a breach with and sometimes in antagonism to its natural tasks and adaptations, surrenders these to the purposes of the natural will. In the real manifestations of this last of the soul's movements, we distinguish ourselves from our bodies so as to use them—as true "tools of tools"¹⁰—for novel ends. The natural will challenges, defies, and overrides physiology, anatomy, and psychology, not by obliterating them but by subjecting them to its own purposes.

However exceptional the results, the subjection is always incomplete. There are, first, spatial and temporal boundaries to the subjectivation of the living body. For one thing, no matter how compliant with spirit's appropriations, our corporeity is recalcitrant to aberrant uses; and in the end, death is the intrinsic limit of all living individuality. But even in the living, the limitations are physical, epistemic, and existential. After all, the objects of the natural will are provided by feeling, feeling is dependent upon sentience, and sentience ultimately rests on the body's physiological affections. This dependence continues to be the case even after the soul-like stage of spirit is sublated. Conscious being and the positing of ends by the conscious will

continue to be rooted in organic life. The difference between posits of the natural will and the ends of consciousness is that the latter can transcend the givens of sentience, of feeling, and even of experience. But the terrain covered by Hegel's *Anthropology* does not include that traveled by Aristotle in the third book of *De anima*. It does not include, in other words, that function of the soul which "thinks all things," is "unmixed with body," is "separable," and is finally "capable of thinking itself" (*Da* III.4 429a–b). More modestly, Hegel's soul in its final transition to spirit finds itself in the equivocal condition of the lord vis-à-vis the bondsman: what the soul wills and desires is, with regard to its real possibility, entirely dependent on the body that is now in its possession. As is true of nature and spirit in the logical Idea, the permeation of individual corporeity by finite spirit is never complete. Just as nature does not vanish when spirit emerges, neither does the human body cease to exist when human spirit declares of it: "this is mine." The *Science of Logic* has shown that concrete identity, as opposed to formal sameness, comprises difference. In the concrete identity of the actual soul, the difference of body and spirit, and hence the subsistence of both, "retains its right" (*Enc* §412 Zus). No degree of intensity of our will and no amount of habit exertion will ever completely overcome the obduracy and insubordination of our physical existence.

Spirit's shaping power is therefore limited by some of the body's "purely organic" aspects, whose extraneous character prompts the soul to "throw them out" (*Enc* §412 Zus). The actual soul's shaping, expelling, and reclaiming of bodiliness and externality are never completed. It is precisely on the basis of this unresolved struggle that natural spirit can become a human "I." For this to happen, however, natural spirit must first become a creature of habit.

The fact that the soul makes itself into an abstract universal being and reduces the particularity of feelings (also of consciousness) to a mere *being*-determination inhering to itself, this is *habit*. In this way the soul is in *possession* of the contents, which it holds in such a way as to . . . have them to itself and move among them in a sentience-less and conscious-less manner . . . This intruding [*Sich-ein-bilden*] of the particularity or corporeity of determinations of feeling into the soul's *being* appears as their *repetition*, and the creation of habit appears as *drill*. (*Enc* §410)

In individuals, habit is the acquired capacity to receive sensations without sensing them, to have feelings without feeling them, and even, as Hegel's parenthetical remark reminds us, to retain cognitive content without knowing it. That this paradoxical condition is possible and real is proven in our daily lives. Dexterity and technical competence are only a subset of the tangible results of the repeated intruding or self-inscribing of particular contents,

aims, and cognitions into the abstract, undetermined, universally receptive being of the human soul.

It would be natural to suspect that Hegel's argument here conceals either a reductive physicalism or its counterpart, a reductive idealism. Yet he forcefully argues that habit formation neither originates in mere physical necessity nor leads to dispensing with corporeity. As is observable in human work, habit formation consists of both one's subjection to the necessity of the mechanisms and chemisms of material nature, and one's liberation from acquiescence to them. The two contrary functions are entirely compatible insofar as (in a Rousseauian twist) the subjection is self-imposed and the liberation is a self-determining act. Philosophers and other educators, Hegel observes, often discuss these functions as separate sides of learning through the formation of habit, with one the allegedly negative, the other the allegedly positive side. In Hegel's conception of habit, however, both are inseparable sides of the same coin. The coin in question is not just the formation of human individuals, but primarily the making of the species.

Hegel goes to great lengths to show habit's irreplaceability in both historical and pedagogical perspective. His elevation of spiritual-physical habituation to the status of a necessary condition of the self-conscious life is part of an implicit criticism of ancient, especially Aristotelian, conceptions of activities aimed at production. For ancient thinkers, the acquisition of the skills needed to exercise any *technē* that ends in a final product—even that of a great artist—amounts to an instrumentalization of the body that ancient society closely associates with servitude or enslavement. For Aristotle, for example, the distinction between activities to be engaged in for their own sake (*praxis*) and those exercised in view of a final product (*poiēsis*) carries essential ethical and political significance.¹¹ And since the best *politeia* is no *demokratia* (given that in the latter, regrettably, everybody ends up engaging in every type of activity), these radically different kinds of agency must fall to separate classes of men. The difference between *praxis* and *poiēsis* is not a merely conceptual one. It translates quite naturally into a difference of ways and standards of life. Productive activities and their attendant mercantile pursuits are, to quote Aristotle, “unworthy” of citizens despite their being necessary for the sustenance and flourishing of the happiest of states: “It is therefore clear . . . that in the best constitution . . . the citizens must not live a mechanic or a mercantile life, for such a life is ignoble and inimical to virtue, nor must those who are to be citizens in the best state be tillers of the soil” (*Politics* VII.9 1328b20). The modern philosopher begs to differ. In the modern state, poietic activity may well still fall to particular classes and their trades, but need no longer be regarded as ignoble. Modernity calls into question not the conceptual distinction between the two types of human endeavor, but their moral evaluation and—in Hegel's wake—the social distribution of *poiēsis* and *praxis*.¹² Yet even independently of its specifically political dimension, the habit formation attendant to *poiēsis* plays for Hegel a pivotal historical role in the making of mankind.

Throughout human history, the liberating role of habit formation has manifested itself in an endless variety of cultural competences: indifference to need satisfaction, extraordinary feats of self-control, inurement to hardship, physical and mental dexterity, the mnemonic powers in preliterate societies, technical expertise, rote learning, and more. The cultural practices of one generation are handed down to the next as if they were genetic legacies. The learned routines of reading and writing, for example, result from the generational acquisition of the extraordinary capacity to simultaneously engage in and detach oneself from the thing at hand—the picture, the ideogram, or the sign. The skilled reader or musician no longer deciphers signs but unlocks their meaning effortlessly, immediately, “naturally.” The musician instrumentalizes her body in such a way “that as soon as the representation (e.g., a series of notes) is in me, the body externalizes it compliantly, fluidly and accurately” (*Enc* §410 Anm). In skill acquisition that is predominantly physical, the body is being subjected—in the double sense of submitting to and rendering subjective—to goals that are extraneous to its biological ends. The dancer’s split leap does not conform to human anatomy; only arduous training makes it possible. Feats like these are real manifestations of the soul’s internal rift and higher reconciliation between its “immediate” or physical and its “mediated” or spiritual (*geistig*)¹³ dimensions—between the flesh and the will:

This particular being of the soul is the moment of its *corporeity* [*Leiblichkeit*], with which at this point the soul breaks, differentiating itself from it as its *simple* being, so as to become the ideal, *subjective* substantiality of this corporeity . . . This abstract being-for-self of the soul in its corporeity is not yet “I” . . . It is corporeity reset to its pure *ideality*, and that is . . . pure *being*, whose . . . immediate corporeity as such has been sublated. (*Enc* §409 and Anm)

Against Aristotle’s depreciation of technical skill-formation as necessary, but not liberatory, Hegel points out that even the most sophisticated, least physical human capacities ultimately rest on mechanical habit formation. Habit, despite its “poietic” character, that is, despite having a final purpose external to itself and notwithstanding its appearance as thoughtless repetition, “is at the same time most essential for the *existence* of all spirituality [*Geistigkeit*] in the individual subject” (*Enc* §410 Anm). As Hegel also points out, despite labeling the habit-forming processes of craft and work as slavish, Aristotle himself makes the habitual exercise (*ethos*) of virtuous behavior into the foundation of his ethics, “so that the content, religious, moral and so on, may inhere in [the individual] as in *this self*, . . . that it may *belong* to it as to *this* soul,” not as mere disposition, feeling, or inscrutable inwardness, “but in its very existence” (*Enc* §410 Anm).

Hegel’s illustrations of the capacities unleashed by self-habituating range from the seemingly trivial to the extraordinarily complex. Each one

exemplifies the immediate unity, obtained in simple experience or in hard training, of body and intellect. One example is human seeing (*sehen*), which is not the merely ocular performance of watching, looking, or glancing at (*schauen*), but a sophisticated merger of ocular and mental functions—as demonstrated in our unmediated seeing of a three-dimensional scene when looking at a two-dimensional painting. But the most prominent example of acquired human powers is the capacity to think. It is the habit of thinking (including mnemonic practices), Hegel claims, that makes the thinker:

Likewise, entirely free *thinking* that is active in the pure element of itself, requires habituation and familiarity, this form of immediacy through which thinking is the unobstructed . . . property of my *singular self*. Only through this habituation do I *exist* for myself as thinking. (*Enc* §410 Anm)

Hegel's reference to "entirely free" pure thinking is meant here as a faint anthropological echo of Aristotle's divine intellect, the *noûs* that is identical with its thoughts and independent of any specialized organ. But in us, Hegel insists, thinking "in the pure element of itself" is inextricable from habit, work, and corporeity. It may even happen to the mortal thinker that "unfamiliarity as well as long furtherance of thinking causes headaches" (*Enc* §410 Anm), a painful experience that only practice can help overcome. Some educators and other professed experts in matters of soul and spirit, we read in this Remark, express disdain for processes of habituation that they consider mind-numbing and unworthy of enlightened creatures. This criticism, Hegel observes, is well taken when it refers to cases in which the purposes of the habituation are contingent or noxious, rather than posited by the learner's will. After all, addictions and compulsive neuroses are also kinds of habit, but they have no liberating function. When the will no longer posits the ends of action, habit turns lethal indeed: "the [mere] habit of living brings on death or, speaking in totally abstract terms, it is death itself" (*Enc* §410 Anm).

Hegel even widens the anthropological function of habituation to include its foundational role in the formation of personhood. We already encounter a treatment of habit in the introductory sections to "Ethical Life" in the *Philosophy of Right*. We are reminded there that just as the erect posture is maintained through our natural or unconscious will, so moral personhood can only be maintained through our conscious free will. We can of course degrade ourselves, or let ourselves be degraded by others or by circumstances, to living a purely animal existence. But this degradation implies an abdication of the will. The habit of regarding oneself as a person is the practical, existential middle ground between the will to be person and the will to renounce this status. This middle ground is what Hegel refers to in §150 of the *Philosophy of Right* as the "spiritual natural history [*geistige Naturgeschichte*]" of virtue. To the custom (*Sitte*) or habit (*Gewohnheit*) that make society into a second

natural world corresponds in individual beings their unreflected adherence to the ethical patterns of that world, an adherence often called virtue (*Tugend*) but better understood as rectitude (*Rechtschaffenheit*) (*RPh* §150). In this sense, virtue is a kind of individual “virtuosity” that precedes all right and morality (*RPh* and *Zus*; see also §150 *Zus* and §151 *Zus*) and is brought about by education, the shaping (*Bildung*) of every generation into finding itself at home in the world it has inherited:

Pedagogy is the art of making the human being ethical: it considers the human being as a natural creature and shows the path to its rebirth, the transformation of its first nature into a second, spiritual one, so that this spirituality in it becomes *habit*. In habit the contrast between natural and subjective will disappears, the subject’s struggle is broken . . . (*RPh* §151 *Zus*)

Habit therefore both provides the foundation for ethical life and enables the mastery of bodily and mental capacities that defines human individuals. Before the training of the ancient citizen to virtuous action, or the habituation of the modern bourgeois to the moral and juridical rules of civil society, there is the habituation of the individual to living as a political animal.

The kind of liberation provided by habit is therefore not actual freedom, but only a necessary step toward it. It is liberation from immediate needs for other pursuits, not the free positing of ends. Not surprisingly then, by creating a second nature inside and outside ourselves, we also become habit’s captives:

Although habit liberates the human being . . . it also makes him . . . its *slave*. On the one hand, [habit] is not *immediate*, *first nature*, . . . but rather *second nature*, *posited* by the soul—but still it is a *nature*, something *posited* that assumes the shape of something *immediate*, an *ideality* of what is [*des Seienden*] still tainted with the form of *being* [*Sein*], hence something inadequate to free spirit, something merely *anthropological*. (*Enc* §410 *Zus*)

Notwithstanding its limited and limiting functions, in the end it is through habit that we enhance our powers of idealization, and it is the transmission of this habit from one generation to the next that liberates the species from first nature, creating the conditions for actual freedom.

The “actuality” with which Hegel designates the final stage of the soul (c. “Die wirkliche Seele”) refers back to the category of actuality from the *Science of Logic*. *Wirklichkeit* is the substantiation of *wirken*, that is, to be effective or at work—a literal rendition of Aristotle’s *energeia* (or, depending on context, *entelecheia*). In the abstract sphere of Hegel’s logic, the meaning of the concept of actuality results from the coalescence of the categories of appearance and essence. In appropriate contexts, Hegel also refers to these

latter two as “externality” and “inwardness,” respectively. In the context of the *Anthropology*, the soul is said to be fully actual in the complete unification of living body (appearance) and selfhood (essence). From the soon-to-be-attained perspective of the “I,” this merging of essence and appearance signifies no less than a novel, practical and theoretical, self-relation. Thus, my body is no longer only the felt horizon of my world, an incomprehensible immediacy of feelings, or the servant of my natural will, but a sign (*Zeichen*) of my essential presence—of my existence as “I.” The “actuality” of the fully human soul refers to the actualization of all the soul’s powers. No longer limited to the purposeful use of the body and organs, the soul also alters the body and reveals its own presence. The fully realized soul transforms the human body into an emblem of itself or, to use the ancient allegory, the soul in its craftsmanlike activity molds the body into a work of its art:

This externality [of the human body] does not represent itself but the soul, and is its *sign*. As this identity of interiority with the externality subjected to it, the soul is *actual*; it has free shape in its corporeity, . . . which, as the artwork of the soul, possesses *human*, pathognomic, and physiognomic expression. (*Enc* §411)

Just as the work of art is a sensible, objective expression of the artist’s subjectivity, so the human body is the sensible, objective manifestation of the actualized soul. And just as the artwork is only a perceptual (“aesthetic”), not a conceptual manifestation of absolute spirit, so the human body is only the perceptible sign, not the conceptual expression of the soul. In the *Lectures on Aesthetics*, the representation of flawless human corporeity in classical Greek sculpture is said to suffer from an intrinsic limitation because—Hegel reminds his Graecophilic audiences—harmony, strength, and beauty are not adequate articulations of spirit.¹⁴ Spirit is far more adequately (though still incompletely) expressed through the medium of language than that of the visual arts. To other species, the human body’s shape and deportment signal the most powerful form of spirit; but for humankind itself, this body is only the emergent sign, the “*first appearance*” (*Enc* §411) of spirituality—no less, but also no more. Hence the unscientific, random character of the “most vacuous ideas” (*Enc* §411) of physiognomists and cranioscopists who profess to decipher the soul from the observation of physical features.¹⁵

I am an “actual” soul, then, when being human has become my habit, or being-for-self has become my second nature. Yet *I only become a self-conscious “I” when this second nature is no longer just habit but the object of my will*. This transformation marks the final stage of existence of natural spirit. The residual mechanical features of habituation are overcome and retained in my conscious, no longer just soul-like, individuality. I can now reflect myself in a world that is the product of my deeds. In this reflection, I am for the first time “objective consciousness.”

Just as matter turned out to be the real appearance, not the truth, of nature, insofar as spirit is this truth, so the truth of the soul's existence as natural phenomenon has turned out to be spirit. The soul has taken possession of its body by first opposing it and then sublating it as a moment of itself. But through this complex movement of diremption, opposition, and sublation, the soul is no longer immediately natural subjective spirit. It has become a mediated form of subjective spirit. This is spirit that inhabits a world in which, to the extent that it has fashioned it to fit its own purposes, spirit recognizes itself:

This being-for-self . . . is the higher awakening of the soul to the "I," [i.e.,] to abstract universality existing *for* abstract universality, which is *thinking* and *subject* for itself, and more specifically, subject of its own judgment . . . [In this judgment] the "I" excludes and relates itself to the natural totality of its determinations as . . . a world *external to it*, so as to reflect itself immediately in this world—*consciousness*. (*Enc* §412)

Compared with the soul's transitions from sentience to feeling or from sleeping to waking states, this "higher awakening" is no longer the arched segment of a natural cycle. It marks, for the natural phenomenon of life, an irreversible turn away from naturality. Through the formation of habit, natural spirit overcomes, reappropriates, and transfigures its own exteriority. Spirit now recognizes its essence, which is subjectivity, in the object of its own making. When Hegel writes that being-for-self has become the "subject of its own judgment," he is making explicit what he takes to be the logical-metaphysical relation between consciousness of objectivity and objectivity itself. The conscious self that has resulted from the sublation of feeling selfness now relates to its own content as to something objectively external to itself. This *prima facie* paradoxical constellation mirrors the constellation of subject and predicate in the categorical judgment that has been discussed here in chapter 2, section 3: at the same time as the copula establishes the subject's identity with the predicate, the judgment also upholds their difference. In this peculiar sense, the "return to itself" of this last shape of spirit is not a circular return to the same, but to an enriched form of the same—enriched, that is, by the moment of difference brought about by spirit's self-diremption:

Through this *reflection-in-itself* spirit completes its liberation from the form of *being*, gives itself the form of *essence* and becomes "I." To wit, insofar as the soul is . . . selfness [*Selbstischkeit*], it already is *in itself* "I." But to the actuality of the "I" belongs more than . . . *natural* subjectivity . . . because the "I" . . . exists in truth only when it has itself as object . . . The universal that relates itself to itself exists nowhere except in the "I." (*Enc* §412 Zus).

The “I” is the singular and at first abstract realization of the universality that is only implicit in life, in the mere being-there (*Dasein*) of the soul. As the *Philosophy of Nature* has shown, in nature that is “merely” living, universality only triumphs through the destruction of singularity: the species is a phoenix that thrives on the ashes of the specimens. But in the sphere of spirit, as Hegel indicates in the last sentence of the quoted passage, the singular and the universal are no longer at odds, and the paradox of a universal singularity becomes real: “The universal that relates itself to itself exists nowhere except in the ‘I.’”

Following a long philosophical and literary tradition that reaches back to Heraclitus, ancient Stoicism, and Neoplatonism (outlined in Baum 1992), the young Hegel had already repeatedly used the image of the “divine spark” to refer to humanity’s share in reason or in the moral law. At the closing of our treatise, he uses the same canonical image to refer to the birth of egoity from the spirit of nature:

The natural soul is at first just the *real possibility* of being-for-self. Only in the “I” does this potentiality become actuality . . . The “I” is the *lightning* that strikes through the soul of nature and consumes its naturalness; in the “I” therefore the *ideality* of naturalness, and that is, the *essence* of the soul, becomes *for* the soul. (*Enc* §412 Zus)

The entire dialectical movement in the *Anthropology* has led to this result: the materiality of living nature having been revealed to be nature’s untrue reality, natural spirit has emerged as the first ideality of nature. But the truth of the latter is that spirit is in-itself free, that is, self-relating and self-determining. The proper concept of spirit is “the Concept, whose existence is . . . absolute negativity, freedom, so that the object or actuality of the Concept is the Concept itself” (*Enc* §389 Zus). The only way in which natural spirit can begin to live up to the Concept is by reflecting itself in a world it shapes—to use the biblical metaphor—after its own image. What the *Anthropology* exhibits is the process by which this singular-universal spirit is formed. It is singular, in that it is a natural being; it is universal, in that it is inwardly unlimited, that is, actually thinking and willing itself. On the threshold of a doctrine of the appearances (Phenomenology) and a doctrine of the faculties of finite spirit (Psychology), the subjectivity we have now reached consists of little more, and no less, than a self or “I” that “*views itself* in its *other* and is this *viewing itself*” (*Enc* §412 Zus). But viewing or intuiting (Hegel uses *anschauen* here) oneself in a world that is not oneself, or not a self at all, is a first momentous sublating of nature, of that “enigma” to which we find ourselves attracted, because “spirit presages itself in it,” and equally “repulsed” because “spirit does not find itself” in such an extraneous reality (*PhN Enc*, W 9:12). By practicing the art of living in a world of its own making, humankind endows itself with freedom in a suitable, recognizable, familiar reality. The world

becomes its home. The evolution of the anthropic soul that we have been witnessing in Hegel's treatise discloses just what kind of freedom is attainable by spirit in its stage as soul. It is not the freedom to shake off naturality or corporeity, nor is it the *historical* precursor of concrete freedom ("*the free will that wills the free will*" from the *Philosophy of Right*; *RPh* §27). Rather, the freedom of natural spirit consists of our Stoic capacity to find ourselves at home (*bei sich sein*) in an originally indifferent world that we learn to shape according to its laws as much as according to our will. The end of Hegel's "actual soul" is a Stoic end: life in a world in which human beings gain freedom through insight into necessity.

NOTES

Preface

1. Among the most sophisticated versions of the naturalistic interpretation are Testa (2013b) and Pinkard (2012).

Introduction

1. Chapter 7 discusses the outsized role played by civil society's unnatural arrangements in the emergence of mental disorders according to Kant (following Rousseau), and the role that the collapse of social structures plays in psychopathologies, according to Pinel. As shown there, Hegel's understanding of insanity is heavily indebted to all three thinkers.

2. This passage is analyzed further in chapter 2.

3. On the meanings of *Genius* (a rendering of the Greek *daimon*) in German letters and in Hegel in particular, see chapter 6. The German *Genius* is not to be conflated with *Genie*; the latter is accurately translated in English as "genius."

4. Paradigmatic of this terminology that potentially undermines the anti-dualistic intentions of the writer is Merleau-Ponty's repeated use of the term *sujet incarné* in the seminal *Phénoménologie de la perception* of 1945. Anthony Steinbock (private communication) explains Merleau-Ponty's subsequent terminological changes precisely as attempts to address the dualistic concerns raised by the notion of "embodiment."

5. Among the newest attempts at correcting the record on "Cartesian dualism," see Hoffman (1986) and Asmuth (2016). The latter highlights how contemporary philosophy turns the "propaedeutic perspective" of the *Meditations* into a simplistic metaphysics of the human being. Hegel's nondualistic interpretation of Descartes is discussed in chapter 1, section 3.

6. See, for example, the *Diagnostic Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5), s.v. "bipolarism." The classifications of the DSM is based on the statistical analysis of observed behaviors but often appears arbitrary because it seems to lack a coherent theory of its general subject matter, the psyche. For example, "bipolarity" is first introduced as the modern equivalent of the nineteenth century's "affective psychosis," which designated patterns of alternation between euphoric and depressive states. But in order to distinguish bipolarism from old-fashioned affective psychosis, the DSM then states that "a major depressive episode is not required" for diagnostic purposes, though "at least one" form of bipolarism must be accompanied by depression. Furthermore, close inspection of the manual's descriptions and designations shows that symptoms characteristic of bipolarism resurface in the definitions of different psychotic disorders of the schizophrenia spectrum, as well as in a vast and generic array of "personality disorders." One type of bipolar disorder even gets the name of Unspecified Bipolarism.

7. These are referenced above in the “Preface.”

8. See especially Berthold-Bond (1995), 15–25, 29–35, and 213–16.

9. Almost all references in the following are to the 1830 edition of the *Encyclopaedia*. Exceptions are expressly noted.

10. The first division (“Doctrine of Being”) was revised by Hegel in 1831 and published posthumously in 1832.

11. Readings of Hegel’s work that either ignore or repudiate its metaphysical foundations have flourished especially (though not exclusively) in Anglophone receptions of Hegel. Standard works in this tradition are Findlay (1958), Hartmann (1972), Pippin (1989), Wood (1990), Pinkard (1994), and Brandom (1998), (1999), and (2002). (For a critique of Brandom [2002] see de Laurentiis 2007.) R. Stern (2009), chapter 4, reconstructs the history of the Anglophone reception of Hegel, especially by the British Hegelians, and points out the contradiction between their metaphysical interpretations of spirit and the absolute, on the one hand, and their nonmetaphysical reading of Hegel’s *prima philosophia*, the *Science of Logic*, on the other. Other enlightening overviews of this tradition are Redding (2007) and Giladi (2016). Among the recent Anglophone scholarship acknowledging the metaphysical dimension of Hegel’s work, see, among others, Beiser (2005), Bowman (2013), and the contributors to de Laurentiis (2016a). A tightly argued and compelling rebuttal of metaphysics-oblivious interpretations is Koch (2007).

12. “Eigenthümliche frühere Arbeit, nicht Umarbeiten—auf die damalige Zeit der Abfassung bezüglich.” Published in Hoffmeister (1952), 578; and in GW 9:448. (With thanks to Walter Jaeschke, director of the Hegel Archives Bochum, for the citation.)

13. An interesting comparative study of sections of the 1827 and 1830 *Anthropology* is Reid (2013).

14. All Aristotle citations in this book are to the Bekker edition. Unless otherwise indicated, *De anima* is quoted from the Hicks translation (1907), with occasional and very slight revisions. For other Aristotelian texts, notes specify the translation used and my revisions, if any.

15. The Bonitz translation of this passage, appended to Hegel’s text by the first editors of the *Philosophy of Spirit*, is discussed in chapter 2.

Chapter 1

This chapter adapts material that first appeared in “Hylemorphism and Hegel’s Account of the Soul,” *Jahrbuch für Hegel-Forschung* 18–20 (2012/14): 247–65; and in “The Aristotelian Metaphysics of Hegel’s ‘Soul,’” in *Hegel and Ancient Philosophy: A Re-Examination*, ed. Glenn A. Magee (London: Routledge, 2018), 115–31.

1. Harris (1997) (vol. 1, *The Pilgrimage of Reason*; vol. 2, *The Odyssey of Spirit*).

2. Despite its fame (or disrepute) as a technical Hegelian term, *Aufhebung* (sublate) is a common German word for quotidian activities (such as conserving something for later use), for physical phenomena, and for logical operations. For the latter two cases, see Kant’s repeated use of *aufheben* in the 1747 “Thoughts on the True Estimation of Living Forces,” for example: “since motions AF and AE oppose one another and are equal, they sublata themselves” (Kant 1976, §74); or his definition of *modus tollens* in the *Logic* as “the sublating form of connection”

(Kant 1962, §26). *Aufheben* belongs to that broad class of self-opposing words that linguists call autantonims, such as the English “oversight” or the Latin *sub-fero* (whose past participle is *sublatum*): to suffer under or to actively carry. On *Aufhebung*, see also Inwood (1992) and Magee (2010).

3. This and the next passage from *Enc* §388 are analyzed in more detail in chapter 2.

4. A subtle account of the complex relation of *Natur* and *Geist* is the classic work by E. E. Harris (1954). Among more recent discussions, see Testa (2013a), which helpfully discusses Hegel’s “naturalism” but understates, in my view, the significance of nature’s *self*-sublation into spirit. From different perspectives, Winfield (2007) and Grier (2013) both stress the circular coimplication of nature and mind in Hegel’s system.

5. The logical connotations of the concept of living individuality are explicated in greater detail in the last subdivision of both the Lesser and Greater Logic, dedicated to the concept of the Idea under the respective headings: “A. Life” (*L Enc* §§216–22) and “A. The living individual” (*L W* 6:474–80).

6. The Merleau-Ponty student Gilbert Simondon gives an apt explanation of *sunolon* from a phenomenologist’s perspective: “The model of being is the *sumolon* . . . Instead of conceiving individuation as a synthesis of form and matter . . . we will represent it as a doubling, a separation, a non-symmetric partition super-vened in a totality, starting out from a singularity” (Simondon 2005, 63).

7. Martineau (1888). See Manning (2013), 176.

8. Pesch (1877) and (1880). See Manning (2013), 181.

9. For Hegel’s use of “the Idea” see Knox (1952), ix; and Inwood (1992), 123–25. Hegel’s brand of hylomorphism is further discussed in chapter 2, in the section entitled “Natural Spirit.”

10. The *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* (*Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*) are in *W* 18, 19, and 20, respectively.

11. In addition to the passages excerpted here, see also *GeschPh W* 20:128, 132, 136, and 141.

12. Here, as in most other passages where mediation (*Vermittlung*) is rendered as a substantivized verb, namely, *das Vermitteln* (the mediating), the latter refers to the activity of thinking.

13. Descartes (1964), *Discours de la methode*, pt. 4 (*AT* 6:31–33).

14. “Universal thinking” means in Hegel “thinking in terms of universals.” Since thinking *sensu stricto* is conceptual grasp, and since concepts, in contrast to intuitions and other representations, are universals, thinking itself can be qualified as the universal activity par excellence.

15. Some details about this transition are discussed in de Laurentiis (2009).

16. On the difference between a history of ideas and the history of philosophy, and in particular, on Hegel’s understanding of the distinction, see de Laurentiis (2005a) and (2005b).

17. Descartes, *Principia*, pt. 1 §7 (*AT* 8:7): “repugnat enim, ut putemus id quod cogitat, eo ipso tempore quo cogitat, non existere.”

18. Hegel’s references are to the “Responses to the Second Objections,” Def. 1, and “Propositio IV.”

19. Hegel’s *sui generis* rehabilitation of the ontological argument in his *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* (1827 and 1831) would warrant more

extensive discussion and comparison with this criticism of Descartes. At issue here, however, is only the relation of the ontological argument to the certainty of *cogito, sum*.

20. Euler (1802), 315 (letter 82, 1760).

21. Aristotle's skeptical report on the pre-Socratic etymologies of *psuchē* (*Da I.2* 405b27–29) is quoted above in this introduction. The classic *Deutsches Wörterbuch* of the Grimm brothers (Grimm 1854–1961; abbreviated as DW) acknowledges the obscurity of the etymological origin of *Seele*: “*Seele*, f. *anima*. A common Germanic word (basic form *saiwalô* . . .) of as yet undisclosed origin and kinship” (DW 15:2851).

22. On Hegel's account of the logical and ontological concept of identity in the *Science of Logic*, see chapter 2, section 3.

23. Once this connection of corporeal life to mental activity is understood as the connection of a necessary condition to its conditioned, it becomes even clearer why epistemic claims following from hypotheses like those of a “Brain in a Vat” (Harman 1973) must lead to nonsense. For a more detailed argument against such hypotheses, see Putnam (1981).

24. On *übergreifen*, see chapter 1, section 2.

25. On Hegel's coinage and uses of the term *Selbstischkeit*, see below, chapters 6 and 7.

26. On the meaning of “magic” in Hegel's usage, see chapter 3, section 2; and chapter 7, section 2.

27. Hume (1779), *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, pt. 2: “What peculiar privilege has this little agitation of the brain which we call thought, that we must thus make it the model of the whole universe?”

Chapter 2

Section 2 of this chapter adapts material that first appeared in “Aristotle in the Nineteenth Century: The Case of Goethe's Study of Life,” *Idealistic Studies* 30, no. 2 (2000): 107–19. Section 4 adapts material from “The Parmenides and De Anima in Hegel's perspective,” *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 53–54 (2006): 51–68.

1. The Introduction to the *Philosophy of Nature* begins with two Additions to a lost main text. Therefore, by way of exception, this passage is cited as *Enc* and page number. Hegel's reference to Aristotle is to *Metaphysics* Λ 982b10.

2. Here and in the next quote I render *aufheben* with “abrogating” because in these contexts its principal connotation leans more toward its common German use: death is the abrogation or annulment of individual life in contrast with the enduring life of the species.

3. To this primitive process of selfhood formation is dedicated chapter 6.

4. Hölderlin ([1795] 1962). For a comprehensive account of the mutual influences between Schelling, Fichte, Schiller, and Hölderlin with regard to the concepts of absolute and original diremption, which were pivotal for German idealism and for Romanticism, see Waibel (1997) and (2002).

5. Kretschmer (1931), chap. 6: “Spiritual Periodicity. The Artist of Life.” Kretschmer reconstructs the basic rhythm of Goethe's life as a “fortunate limiting case” of the manic-depressive traits allegedly pervasive in his family.

6. An early recognition of this is found in Meyer-Abich (1961). See the rich bibliography on the color controversy in Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke*, especially vol. 23/1. For Hegel's sympathetic reconstruction of Goethe's approach, see *PhN Enc* §320 and Zus. Perhaps prescient of the fate of his own work on nature among the public, Hegel writes here: "Newton's own attempts . . . have been aped in hundreds of later abridgements. This notwithstanding . . . people have argued against Goethe because he is a poet and not a professor . . . Such people often want to be . . . the exclusive possessors of science . . . [just like] the jurists. But right exists for all, and equally color." A scientifically informed reevaluation of Hegel's nuanced criticism of Newton is Nasti De Vincentis (1991).

7. Meyer-Abich (1961), 1216: "It is impossible to distinguish clearly what is Platonic and what is Aristotelian in Goethe."

8. Among scientific recognitions of Aristotle's *avant la lettre* contribution to the concept of molecular information is Loewenstein (1999), who, however, rather typically also disavows any thought of teleology for the biological sciences, calling it "the mistress we can live without" (326–28).

9. These works are collected today in Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke*, vols. 13, 23, 24, and 25. An excellent critical presentation of Goethe's works in and about science, and one that is equally useful for an appreciation of Hegel's philosophy of nature, is Wachsmut (1963).

10. SW 13 collects Goethean aphorisms on aesthetic, ethical, and scientific themes under the title *Sprüche in Prosa*. These are the same texts traditionally given the name *Maximen und Reflektionen*.

11. Linnaeus (1735) 1758.

12. "Wer will was Lebendigs erkennen und beschreiben, / Sucht erst den Geist herauszutreiben, / Dann hat er die Teile in seiner Hand, / Fehlt leider! nur das geistige Band. / *Encheiresin* naturae nennt's die Chemie/Spottet ihrer selbst und weiss nicht wie." I have slightly modified the translation by Ch. T. Brooks (Goethe 1856).

13. "Hier diesen Schlüssel nimm. / . . . / Merkst du nun bald, was man an ihn besitzt?/Der Schlüssel wird die rechte Stelle wittern,/Folgt ihm hinab, er führt dich zu den Müttern."

14. Buffon (1750–89).

15. These preparatory writings include "Die Metamorphose der Pflanzen" ("The Metamorphosis of Plants"); "Versuch, die Metamorphose der Pflanzen zu erklären" ("Attempt at an Explanation of Plant Metamorphosis"); and "Vorarbeiten zu einer Physiologie der Pflanzen" ("Toward a Physiology of Plants"). All are collected in Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 1.

16. The characterization of Plato's "ideas" as unchanging is of course a simplification. It is appropriate if referred to earlier dialogues (see, e.g., *Phaedo* 78d: "does each of them [ideas] . . . remain the same and never in any way tolerate any change whatever? It must remain the same and in the same state"), but in later dialogues change becomes an inherent feature of the ideas and is even itself an idea (see *Sophist* 254d: "the two most important kinds we've been discussing are *that which is, rest, and change*"). It is Aristotle, however, who brings movement in all its variations (including metabolism and self-transformation) down to earth, as it were, making it a paradigm of reality, understood as the perennial actualization of potentialities.

17. The first statement (“nothing is in the intellect that has not been in perception”) is a traditional empiricist interpretation of *Da* III.8 432a5–10. In his Aristotle lecture (*GeschPh* W 19:132–249), Hegel points out that in this one-sided form the claim is un-Aristotelian (see in particular 164 and 214–21). Indeed, in this passage Aristotle explicitly states that images derived from sensations do exist in an immaterial way: *phantasmata* are like sensations but *aneu hulēs* (“without matter”) (*Da* III.8 432a9–10).

18. For Hegel’s conception of the proper subject matter of a speculative logic, which he often refers to as “the Logical,” see chapter 2, section 4, n. 39.

19. This distinction is essential in Hegel’s political philosophy as well. It is made explicit in his criticism of contractarian justifications of the legitimate state (see *RPh* §§257–65). The distinction plays a crucial role in Hegel’s criticism of Rousseau’s vacillations between a conception of the will as the sum of particular interests (*volonté de tous*), which for Hegel is embodied in civil society, and a conception of the will as the universal interest (*volonté générale*), which is realized only in the legitimate state (*Rechtsstaat*) (see *RPh* §258 Anm.).

20. Aristotle, *Metaphysics* Z 2 1028b34 and Z 4 1029b12.

21. This is the Hegelian lesson at the core of Marx’s 1847 criticism of Proudhon’s *The Philosophy of Poverty* (Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 4:63–182). To state with Proudhon or Brissot that property is theft (*la propriété c’est le vol*) is not wrong but is a bloodless tautological objection to capitalist reality. If what is meant by “property” is private property, that is, the exclusion of others from access to the common, then all the slogan states is that “theft is theft,” or that excluding others from access to the means of production is to deprive them of the means of production. See also Marx’s January 24, 1865, letter to J. B. Schweizer in Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 16:25–32.

22. For the renewal of interest in classical philosophies of nature (though usually not Hegel’s) evident in contemporary cosmology, see, among others, Barrow and Tipler (1986). This eclectic work could not avoid serious philosophical misunderstandings. For example, Kant’s thing-in-itself is explained as the unobservable “physically real universe;” absolute idealism is taken to be equating “the Universe with its simulation”; the Turing test is said to imply that “subprograms” of the universe “have to be regarded as persons”; and Fichte’s *Gegenstand*, called a “synthesis of concepts,” is assimilated in the same breath to Bohr’s quantum-mechanical object and to Hayek’s definition of capital (Barrow and Tipler 1986, 153–57). Some critics have pointed out the theological undercurrent of this work (see, e.g., M. Gardner 1986). However, the volume remains a rare attempt by twentieth-century physicists to bring together science and philosophical theories in order to explain the relation between the inorganic universe and its life forms. It brings some of the sophistication of natural philosophies to the attention of an academic public that is more often inclined to ridicule than to study them. For a informed scholarly interpretation of the “anthropic principle” see E. E. Harris (1991).

23. The syllogistic compendium of this transition in the final sections of the *Encyclopaedia* (*PhS Enc* §§575–77) is discussed later in this chapter.

24. I am indebted to Michael Wolff, Universität Bielefeld, for his invaluable help in clarifying this difficult passage.

25. See *PhN Enc* W 9:12, quoted at this chapter’s beginning.

26. The full quote has been given in this Introduction. The definitive commentary on *Enc* §389 is Michael Wolff (1992).

27. The available translations of the phrase *logoi enuloi* span the gamut from literal to adventurous to bizarre: “the affections of soul are enmattered accounts” (Smith 1984, 643); “the attributes [of soul] are evidently forms or notions realized in matter” (Hicks 1907, 7); and “the attributes of the soul have materiality in the very statements of them” (Sachs 2004, 50). Thomas Aquinas’s explication of *logoi enuloi* as “material principles, i.e., such that must exist in matter” (Aquinas 1994, 10 [Lecture II, 22]) is probably still the best one. I use “enmattered concepts” because it has the advantage of straightforwardness.

28. A thorough contemporary discussion of hylomorphism in Aristotle is Shields (2016). What Shields considers the “weakness” of Aristotle’s hylomorphism of living nature (see the two “Supplements” to his text) results in my view from his conceptualizing the “live body” as a combination or synthesis of matter and form, instead of an internally differentiated identity, a *sunolon*.

29. See Blumenbach (1790), 1806 (*Beyträge zu Naturgeschichte*), chapters 8 and 9. Other important sources for Hegel are Ackermann (1797) and (as indicated by the editors of GW 20) J. H. F. Authenrieth (1801–2). The latter’s work, together with that of the author’s son (see H. F. Authenrieth 1821) are repeatedly cited by Hegel in the chapters on “Vegetable Nature” and “Animal Organism” in the *Philosophy of Nature* (Division Three, B and C). The auction inventory of Hegel’s personal library lists editions of the major works by Blumenbach, Ackermann, and the younger Authenrieth. Blumenbach’s groundbreaking contributions to monogenism and the concept of the human species and its races are discussed below, in chapter 4.

30. “On cherche dans des considérations abstraites la définition de la vie; on la trouvera, je crois, dans cet aperçu général: *La vie est l’ensemble des fonctions qui résistent à la mort.*” Bichat (1805), 3rd edition, 1 (also in Hegel’s personal library). Citations of Bichat abound in the *Philosophy of Nature* under the heading “Animal Organism” as well as in the *Anthropology* (§389 Zus and §401 Zus).

31. I have modified Hicks’s “owing to their relationship” (Hicks 1907, 27) to better reflect the “immediacy” of the relationship of soul and body in *koinōnia*.

32. *Parts of Animals* (translation by W. Ogle), in Aristotle (1984), 1:1005.

33. For Hegel’s use of “souls” in the plural, see, for example, §395 Zus: “The single souls distinguish themselves from one another through an infinite amount of contingent modifications”; and §390 Zus: “the universal soul of nature becomes actual only in the singular souls.”

34. The concept of “real idealization” is discussed in chapter 3, section 1.

35. Hegel’s remark (reinforced by comments in the Addition to this section) that *Seele* is in this respect akin to Aristotle’s *noūs pathētikos* has seemed incongruous to commentators like Ferrarin (2001) because *noūs* is of course not a species of *psuchē*. Yet Aristotle’s treatise, as the quoted passages show, is dedicated to the soul in all its functions, including those that, like passive and active intellect, seem to leave natural soul altogether behind. Despite the well-documented textual problems of *De anima*, there seems to be no compelling philological reason, much less a philosophical one, to assume that the subject matter of book 3 must be drastically separated from those of books 1 and 2—as advocated by

Lawson-Tancred (1986), 204, among others. There are good philosophical reasons to read with Hegel all three extant books as one (however incomplete or corrupted) treatise on the soul.

36. See Bodei (1975), Düsing (1986), Peperzak (1987), Nuzzo (2004), and Inwood (2013).

37. Nuzzo (2004) emphasizes that this pivotal characterization of the three syllogisms as internal divisions of the Idea has gone largely unnoticed in the literature.

38. Schick (2006).

39. The most incisive critical accounts of *das Logische* and its problems in Hegel are Inwood (1992), 268–71; and Wolff (2013), 71–101. The latter shows that the object of the *Science of Logic* covers (i) the subject matter of Aristotle's *Organon* (categories, elements of judgment, syllogisms, and proof procedures); (ii) the laws of thought (noncontradiction, *tertium non datur*) from Aristotle's *Metaphysics*; (iii) ordinary formal logical laws; and (iv) the subject matter of Kant's transcendental analytic and dialectic: the categories of the understanding and the antinomies of reason.

40. In Aryeh Kosman's most accurate translation, *noēsis noēseōs noēsis* is "thinking thinking thinking" (Kosman 2013, 225).

41. The expression *die Natur der Sache* (elsewhere, *die Sache selbst*) denotes the essential trait (*Natur*) of any given subject matter (*Sache*). Here, the subject matter is the whole of actuality.

42. The relation of the triadic-syllogistic structure of Hegel's system with the triads of Neoplatonism is explained in detail in Inwood (1992), 296–98, and (1983), 294–99. On the last syllogism being discussed here, see also Inwood (2013), 205–8.

43. The note that accompanies the Greek text in *W* is inserted by the editors, and the translation is Hermann Bonitz's, not Hegel's. It was published in 1848–49, seventeen years after Hegel's death. Hegel simply published the Greek text from his personal copy of the Casaubon edition 1590, reissued by Schleiermacher.

44. Like Bonitz's translation of this passage from the *Metaphysics*, Hicks (1907) too renders *theōria* as "speculation" in his translation of *De anima*. On the other hand, Hicks does not use "speculation" for *theōria* in his translation of the *Metaphysics*.

45. Stephen Menn (private communication) notes that Bonitz's translation makes "the divine" ("the godhead") into the subject, and "living being" into the predicate of this sentence: "Die Gottheit, sagen wir, ist das ewige, beste lebendige Wesen." Menn points out that the subject matter of this and the preceding chapters of *Metaphysics* Λ is not the godhead but the living being, the animal, and that one form of life is the activity of *noūs*. Thus, Aristotle is more likely saying that the being whose life is *noēsis* is divine, rather than that God is *noēsis*. This would probably be more in line with Hegel's understanding than Bonitz's interpretation.

46. My translation is based on a three-way comparison between the Bekker edition annotated by Jaeger (1957), Ross (1984), and Bonitz (1848–49). Outstanding recent essays that include discussions of this complex passage and its context are German (2018); Menn (2010), 93–121; and Koch (2010), 177–87.

47. For Aristotle's conception of life forms as "mortal imitations of divine life," see Diamond (2015).

48. See Aristotle's discussion of continuity and discreteness, rest and motion, indivisibility and limit, as well as his critical reconstruction of Zeno's paradoxes in books 6 and 7 of the *Physics*.

49. The "hand" is, again, a reference to Aristotle, *Metaphysics* Z 11, 1036b30–32, where it is stated that it is impossible to define the animate "without reference to parts . . . in a certain state. For it is not a hand in any which state that is part of a man, but the hand . . . alive. If it is not alive, it is not a part." The references to the other organs are direct allusions to *Da* II.1 412b18: "For, if the eye were an animal, eyesight would be its soul, this being the substance according to the concept of the eye."

50. *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte* (1822–31), contained in W 12.

51. The argument is made already in chapter 3 of *PhenG* W 3:107–36, and in the greater *Logic*, section on Appearance, A: "The Thing and Its Qualities" (*L* W 6:129–39).

52. For Hegel as for Linnaeus, Leibniz, or Newton, *natura non facit saltus*. This applies of course to the gap that *seems* to separate inorganic from organic bodies. Hegel and his contemporaries are well aware of overlapping phenomena between these two realms. On the intermediate nature of crystals, for example, which may be said to self-reproduce in a quasi-organic manner, see the Additions to *PhN Enc* §§339–41, §355, and §365.

53. Compare *PhenG* W 3:28: "That substance is essentially subject, this idea is expressed in the representation of the absolute as *spirit*."

54. The translation of Kehler and Griesheim's manuscripts is in Hegel (1978), trans. Petry, 2:16–21.

Chapter 3

Section 1 of this chapter adapts material that first appeared in "The Parmenides and De Anima in Hegel's Perspective," *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 53/54 (2006): 51–68.

1. de La Mettrie (1994), 71. More than 150 years later, Freud's notion of *psychisches Apparat* still echoed this understanding.

2. Quoted in the epigraph of this book's Introduction.

3. For a more detailed analysis of this part of the dialogue, see Düsing (1983) and (2001).

4. Cornford et al. translate "the supposition of myself" as "my own original supposition," transforming a metaphysical hypothesis into an epistemological one.

5. In the following, the *Critique of Pure Reason* is abbreviated as *KrV* followed by A or B and page numbers. At *KrV* B 97–98, Kant argues that while ordinary logic does not recognize the infinite judgment as a particular type, transcendental logic does, because it "also considers the value or content" of the claim made by this judgment "by means of a merely negative predicate."

6. J.-J. Rousseau ([1762] 1943), 71: "On vit tranquille aussi dans les cachots; en est-ce assez pour s'y trouver bien? Les Grecs enfermés dans l'autre du Cyclope y vivoient tranquilles, en attendant que leur tour vint d'être dévorés."

7. The full quote is in chapter 2, section 4.

8. The *Lectures on Aesthetics* (*Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik*) are collected in W vols 13, 14 and 15. The translations are mine, but I consult Knox (1975) throughout. The passage cited here is in Knox (1975), 1:325.

9. de La Mettrie (1994), 30.

10. German grammar, in particular, the feminine gender of *Seele* contrasted with the neutral *Leib*, *Leben*, and *Tier* or the masculine *Körper*, helps parse Hegel's at times intricate prose in ways that are obscured by the ubiquitous neutral pronouns in English. Referring to *Seele* with feminine pronouns would help avoid some philosophically relevant misunderstandings, as exemplified by Petry's translation of this passage. Hegel's claim here is that "das tierische Leben, . . . das Empfindende" reveals the "Allgegenwart der einen Seele in allen Punkten ihrer Leiblichkeit" (*Enc* §389 Anm; my emphasis). Petry translates: "the sentient being in animal life . . . reveals the omnipresence of the single soul in all points of its corporeity" (Hegel 1978, 2:13; my emphasis). This may be read as a claim that the soul is omnipresent in all points of the animal body, while Hegel's point is that the soul is necessarily "omnipresent" in all points of *her own* corporeity: bodily life is precisely the first mode of being of the soul.

11. Matter's lacking truth by itself has been discussed earlier in chapter 2, section 4.

12. This is another reference to Plato's *Parmenides*, 139e–140d. Petry also suggests *Timaeus* 48e–53c, where the discussion of the Undetermined (*chōra*) containing the seamless cycle of water, earth, air, and fire leads to the rational necessity of embracing (Platonic) idealism. For the proof (in the lesser *Logic*) that matter and form are "*in-themselves* the same," see *L W* 8, *Enc* §128–130.

13. The transcribed manuscript reads "*er*," which would refer to *der Geist*. The likelihood is that it should read "*es*," referring to *das Leibliche*. We can only understand the body's comportment if we grasp it as resulting from its idealization by spirit.

14. Translated by Petry as a footnote in Hegel (1978), 2:17–19.

15. This is Aristotle's attribution to Anaxagoras in *Da* III.4 429a19.

16. The full quote is given in the following pages.

17. The preferred translation of *Empfindung* as "sentience" is explained in chapter 6.

18. On *Selbstischkeit* as embryonal *Selbst*, see chapter 6.

19. Joe Sachs's translation of *De anima's* *ousia* as "thinghood" rather than "substance" or "essence" is consistent with his Heidegger-inflected interpretation. Hegel would probably object that "thinghood" is misleading on account of the meaning of *Ding* and *Dingheit* in classical philosophy. See Sachs (2004).

20. The contrast with Plato's concept of a living, ensouled, intelligent world (*kosmos zōos empsuchos ennous*) in the *Timaeus* is instructive. On the one hand, even for Plato, the demiurge must follow the logic of things: "the creator, reflecting on the visible things, found that no unintelligent creature . . . was fairer than the intelligent . . . and that intelligence could not be present in anything devoid of soul." On the other hand, Plato's account, contrary to Hegel's account, is top-down: "For which reasons . . . he put intelligence in soul and soul in body . . . We may say therefore . . . that the world became an animal with soul and intelligence by the foresight of the divine" (*Timaeus* 29e–30b).

21. For the story of the transcriptions of the *Philosophy of Spirit* by Boumann, Griesheim, Mullach, Henning, and Michelet that the Verein von Freunden des Verewigten decided to integrate in the first edition, as well as for criticisms of this decision by Rosenkranz, Lasson, Hoffmeister, Nicolin, and Pöggeler, see the editors' Remark to the third part of the *Encyclopaedia*, *PhS Enc W* 10:423–31. For a thorough account of this editorial history, see the introduction to Hegel (1994) by the editors, Hespe and Tuschling.

22. For a concise account of the continuity and difference between mechanical, chemical, and organic systems from the logical point of view, see part 2 of the *Science of Logic* ("Doctrine of the Concept") II 1 c: "Transition of mechanism [to chemism]" (*L W* 6:427–28); and II 2 c: "Transition from chemism [to teleology]" (*L W* 6:434–36).

23. On the symbiosis and sympathy of individual organisms with the rest of the universe, see Mesmer (1766) and Falconer (1781). Chapters 6 and 7, below, discuss the influence of this literature on Hegel. A detailed discussion of these (and other) aspects of Hegelian thought is Magee (2001).

24. In the *Philosophy of Nature* two such sightings (1811 and 1819), each followed by exceptional vintages, are mentioned explicitly, the vintages representing a "twofold experience" even preferable to that of the comet's return (*PhN Enc* §279 Zus).

Chapter 4

This chapter adapts material that first appeared in "Race in Hegel: Text and Context," in *Philosophie nach Kant: Neue Wege zum Verständnis von Kants Transzendental- und Moralphilosophie*, ed. Mario Egger (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), 591–624.

1. Lamarck (1809) and Treviranus (1802). See also the extensive notes in Hegel (1978), trans. Petry, 2:447ff.

2. This, despite obvious mistranslations of manuscript texts even by superb translators like Petry. For example, Hegel's "advantage" (*Vorzug*) in the Kehler and Griesheim manuscripts (Hegel 1978, trans. Petry, 47) is rendered throughout as "superiority." But there is no reference whatsoever to superiority (*Überlegenheit*) in this text. Rather, we are told that "no color has an advantage; it is only a matter of habit." The only possible "objective advantage" of white skin is that it makes "the animalic and spiritual inwardness more visible." In other words, emotional states, Hegel believes, are easier to spot on white persons. He calls debates on white versus dark skin "an idle question, without intrinsic interest," because "the condition of human beings [*das Verhältnis der Menschen*] is determined by their reason . . . it is here that they have rights, all other difference applying to subaltern conditions," so that even (alleged) advantages have nothing to do with "what constitutes the truth, the dignity of the human being" (German text in Hegel 1978, trans. Petry, 47; English text on p. 46).

3. On the limitations of Hegel's knowledge of African political life in his century, see Bernasconi (1998).

4. Rousseau ([1762] 1943), I 7: "que quiconque refusera d'obéir à la volonté générale y sera contraint par tout le corps: ce qui ne signifie autre chose, sinon qu'on le forcera d'être libre."

5. Rousseau ([1762] 1943), III 8: “La liberté, n’ étant pas un fruit de tous les climats, n’est pas à la portée de tous les peuples. Plus on médite ce principe établi par Montesquieu plus On en sent la vérité.”

6. Here Hegel explicitly cross-references the relevant section of the *Phenomenology of Spirit* (“Lordship and Bondage”), as well as sections of the 1817 *Encyclopaedia* starting with §325 (replaced by §§430–35 in the 1830 edition).

7. A selection of contemporary contributions representing both sides of the debate on whether the concept of race is pivotal or peripheral in Hegel’s philosophy of spirit includes Neugebauer (1990); D’Souza (1995); Bernasconi (1998); Bernasconi and Lott (2000); Bernasconi (2000); Hoffheimer (2001); McCartney (2003); Bernasconi (2003); Houlgate (2005); Bonetto (2006); Buck-Morss (2009); Buchwalter (2009); and Parekh (2009).

8. Bernasconi (2000), 171 and 191. In other similar cases, “Eurocentrism” is used as a synonym for “white racism” instead of denoting a type of ethnocentrism or, in the European case, a cluster of ethnocentrisms. On the need to distinguish ethnocentrism from racism, see the helpful discussion in Bonetto (2006), 35–64.

9. See Bernasconi (2000), 179.

10. Bonetto (2006).

11. Hegel is echoing the widespread views of writers and travelers like Charles de Brosses’s (1760) ruminations on West African religiosity as the primitive and irrational worship of sculpted images carved by the worshippers themselves. It took the radical universalization of the anthropological perspective inaugurated by Marx, Engels and their followers to show that “fetishism”—a word introduced by de Brosses—is integral to *all* religions and, more fundamentally, to the alienated relation of human individuals, under specifiable conditions, from particular activities, productions, and other human individuals. On the history of “fetishism” begun by de Brosses, see the recent work by Morris, Leonard, and de Brosses (2017).

12. Hegel’s transcribed references to social and political mores in the African continent, including the tyrannical character of indigenous rulership and the treatment of slaves, are strongly reminiscent of John Barbot’s 1732 memoirs.

13. On the controversy between Hegel and Friedrich A. G. Tholuck (1799–1877) with regard to the Trinitarian principle in religion and politics, as well as the principle’s putative origins in Eastern thought, see Thompson (2013).

14. For a radical rejection of Hegel’s interpretation of the founding of Haiti, see the comprehensive, if eclectically argued and strangely acrimonious account in Buck-Morss (2009).

15. Hegel (1978), trans. Petry, 2:63–64.

16. The analogy between Mongol and locust invasions (which was still in propagandistic use against Bolshevik Russia in Nazi Germany) is at least as old as the thirteenth-century Chronicle of Novgorod: “That same year [1238 AD] foreigners called Tartars came in countless numbers, like locusts, into the land of Ryazan” (<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/novgorod1.asp>).

17. The extraordinary attention to detail displayed in Mongol and ancient Chinese administration, jurisprudence, and decorative arts had already struck Italian, Arab, and Persian historians in the thirteenth century as a successful but extraordinarily pedantic strategy: see Lane (2006). On the Mongols’ meticulous planning of sieges and their fastidious cataloging of loot in the thirteenth century, see Weatherford (2004), chapters 4, 7, and 8.

18. This refers to figures like the Dalai Lama and the Brahmin.

19. For more on Hegel's assessment of Islam, see Thompson (2013), 102–15.

20. In *PhGesch* W 12:431 Hegel connects Islamic fanaticism with political terror: “*La religion et la terreur* was here [in Islam] the principle, just as *la liberté et la terreur* was for Robespierre.” This is further discussed in chapter 7. On Hegel's connecting Islam and fanaticism, see the well-informed contributions of Thompson (2013) and Dudley (2013).

21. Due to the paradigmatic and influential character of their works, only two prominent polygenist thinkers from the seventeenth and eighteenth century are being treated in the following. For some other likely targets of Hegel's criticism, see Hegel (1978), trans. Petry, 2:449.

22. *Historisch* refers to natural history (or, depending on context, to historiography), while *geschichtlich* refers to the development of spirit. See chapter 5, section 1.

23. The disconcerting qualifier “rigid” (*starr*) that accompanies “distinctions” is consistent with the claim from the Africa lecture (discussed earlier) that the abolition of slavery in the Americas ought to be gradual rather than sudden.

24. Home (1775). All quotes are from this edition, 1:5–14.

25. Batavia was the Latin name originally given by the Romans to the Netherlands. It eventually became the modern name for the Dutch East Indies.

26. Despite Home's fondness for what he takes to be facts, the descriptions and depictions of Cochin's Jews in Malabar (southern India) since the twelfth century always refer to them as “black Jews,” consistent with their being ethnically related to Ethiopians. A very early report on the Cochin Jews is given by Benjamin of Tudela (1130–73) in *The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela* (first published in 1543). (In the nineteenth century, Adolf Asher dedicated a German translation of this Hebrew text to Alexander von Humboldt.) The full translated text of the *Itinerary* can be found at <http://www.archive.org/details/itineraryofrabb01benj>. A critical edition is M. A. Adler's 1907 *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, accessible through Project Gutenberg at https://www.gutenberg.org/files/14981/14981-h/14981-h.htm#FNanchor_24_24.

27. See Willoughby (2010), 153–60.

28. Blumenbach (1775) and 1795 (*De Generis Humani Varietate Nativa*, first and third editions); Blumenbach (1790) and 1806 (*Beyträge zur Naturgeschichte*, first and second editions). Both works, together with further materials, were translated and edited by Thomas Bendyshe (Blumenbach [1865] 1969, trans. Bendyshe). Bendyshe's translation of the *Beyträge* is from the second edition. The quotes from Blumenbach given here are my own translations from both first editions.

29. Before acquiring a derogatory meaning, the eighteenth-century Dutch term “Hottentot” designated southern African hunter-gatherers other than Bantus.

30. Blumenbach's reference is to James Burnett, Lord Monboddo, author of metaphysical treatises, jurist, early linguist, deist, protoevolutionist, and nemesis of Henry Home. Blumenbach quotes Monboddo: “The orang-utans are proved to be of our species by marks of humanity that I think are incontestable.” Not surprisingly, the two noblemen are said to have studiously avoided each other when both residing in Edinburgh.

31. Bendyshe's distortions of Blumenbachian formulations are discussed in more detail in Michael (2017).

32. New research has revealed the identity of “young Freidig”—a household name for Blumenbach’s readers: born in Poland (ca. 1778) as Hyeronimus Hyppolitus de Augustus (ca. 1778–1830), renamed Hyeronimus Fredericus Bridgtown (eventually Bridgtower) by his father, who hailed from Bridgetown, Barbados. This child prodigy performed all over Europe, including Revolutionary Paris. Very few of his compositions survive. Beethoven originally dedicated the Kreutzer Sonata to Bridgtower. See William A. Hart, “New Light on George Bridgtower,” *Musical Times* (Autumn 2017).

33. For Camper’s *Sämmtliche Kleine Schriften* (1781–90), see Hegel (1978), trans. Petry, 2:450. Camper used craniometry before Blumenbach did. He is mostly known today for having identified prognathism as an important racial feature. While his followers associated prognathism with primitivity, Camper did not. His main discovery actually pertained to the existence of a bone shared by all primates except humans—a fact that strengthened his monogenist convictions and perhaps even his political advocacy of racial equality.

34. See Kant (1785), 1969b, 105.

35. Juncker (1998). The vertical rearrangement is printed in Gould (1996), 409. Blumenbach’s own horizontal depiction is plate 4 of *De Generis* (1795) and is reproduced as such in the appendix to Blumenbach (1865) 1969, trans. Bendyshe. Gould’s mispresentations of other scientists’ work are documented in other cases as well; see, for example, Renschler and Monge (2008).

36. I owe this and the following etymological clarifications to Elke Gehweiler of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, who provided relevant texts (the entries “Ausarten” and “Ausartung”) and commentary from the revised *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Grimm 1965–).

37. Engels (1884).

38. Quoted in Willoughby (2010), 169.

39. Quoted in Rainger (1978), 55. Hunt’s “ethno-climatology” is deeply indebted to Henry Home’s conception of degeneracy by resettlement, discussed above in section 2.

40. See Haeckel (1868) and (1899).

41. Schleicher (1861–62).

42. On the idea of orthogenesis, see Wolpoff and Caspari (1997), chapter 8; and Bowler (1983) and (2009). From a purely conceptual perspective, orthogenesis is at the core of the vitalism of Teilhard de Chardin (who studied paleontology alongside theology) and of Henri Bergson’s idea of the *élan vital*.

43. See Goethe, *Faust* 2, lines 6255–65, quoted in chapter 2, section 2.

Chapter 5

1. Modern German’s words *geschehen* and *Geschehnis* are derived from the Old High German *scehanto*, “to turn out suddenly.”

2. Martin Heidegger’s use (in Heidegger 2003 and 2006) of *Er-eignis* as appropriation of the “seen” (using *-eignis* as if it were etymologically related to *Auge*) is of course entirely his own.

3. See Marx and Engels (1845) 1978; Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 3:21: “One can distinguish men from the animals through consciousness, through religion, through whatever else one wishes. They themselves begin to self-distinguish from the animals as soon as they begin to *produce* their means of subsistence . . .

[A] mode of production is not simply . . . reproduction of the physical existence of individuals. It is rather a determinate kind of activity . . . a determinate mode of life.”

4. “Nation” is often used to translate *Volk*. The German term *Nation* is a political concept, better translated as “nation-state.”

5. In this legal text, the potential for “pollution” is identified in the following individual types: “an incendiary, a prisoner, he who eats the food given by the son of an adulteress, a seller of soma, he who undertakes voyages by sea, a bard, an oil-man, a suborner to perjury” (*Laws of Manu* III, verse 158). For the specific issue of pollution and travel outside India, see Clémentin-Ojha (2009).

6. Among contemporary studies of ancient ethnocultural attributions to Greek “local spirits” and their near-complete unreliability, see Dover (1994), 83–87. Demosthenes, for example, is of the opinion that Athenians “as a rule” (meaning almost “by nature”) tend to avoid aggressive policies, are naturally patriotic, and are justly proud of their benevolence and rectitude. By contrast, Thessalians are normally duplicitous, Thebans are proud of their cruelty and dishonesty, and Phaselites (Greeks who preferred Persian rule) are dangerously cunning in commerce. The slightly more balanced views of Euripides and Aristophanes are that Spartans have as much inborn bravery as they harbor perfidy.

7. Thus, according to Hegel, the famed tolerance (including the church’s) for the pagan recasting of Catholic rites and doctrine in Italian locales, or the Italian popular acceptance of a range of sexual customs proscribed in nineteenth-century Northern Europe, would result from this national culture’s *laissez-faire* on matters of principle.

8. Kamen (1997).

9. Marx’s critique of Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right* drew in part from Hegel’s own assessment of German peculiarities in the European context. For example, the echo of Hegel’s words is unmistakable in the following: “As the ancient peoples went through their pre-history in . . . *mythology*, so we Germans have gone through our post-history in thought . . . We are philosophical contemporaries of the present without being its historical contemporaries . . . In politics, the Germans *thought* what other nations *did*” (Marx [1843] 1981; Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 1:385).

10. Hegel’s *schlechte Unendlichkeit* is often translated as “bad infinity.” But its antonym is true, not good, infinity (*wahre*, not *gute*, *Unendlichkeit*). Well into the nineteenth century, the German word *schlecht* carried the primary meaning of “plain” (retained in modern German’s *schlicht*). Martin Luther, for example, accused Catholics of viewing the Pope as “an earthly god, who is not simply human [*ein jrrdischen got, der nicht schlecht mensche . . . sey*]” but a (heathen-like) combination of divine and human. I suspect that Hegel’s use of *schlecht* as a technical term in the *Science of Logic* is Luther’s. The term is best rendered as “mere,” “simple,” or “plain.” This original sense is retained in contemporary German’s adverbial uses: *schlechtin hervorragend* (simply outstanding), and idioms: *schlicht und einfach* (plain and simple).

11. For Hegel, necessity pertains to the universality or essence of what is, never to its particular being or singular existence. We learn from Hume that a particular event may be considered the necessary cause of another for a number of altogether subjective reasons. Like Kant, Hegel does not think it cogent to conclude

from this that there is no objective necessity. It only follows from Hume's proof that the objective necessity of causal connections lies elsewhere than in subjective experience. For Hegel, this "elsewhere" is the ground (*Grund*) shared by two events. Their objective causal nexus is therefore a relation pertaining to the ground of both. And since the ground contains both potency and actuality, this in turn implies that true (or absolute) necessity is precisely the ground that binds possibility and actualization. In Hegel's formulation: "absolute necessity is . . . the truth in which actuality and possibility . . . recede" (*L W* 6:215).

12. See Hegel (1978), trans. Petry, 2:464–67, for plentiful references to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century studies that form the background of Hegel's discussion.

13. On *Genius* as referring to the core of individual personality, instead of extraordinary capabilities, in German usage during Hegel's time, see chapter 7, section 2.

14. The possibility that this might be at least a partial explanation for the scarcity of genius in modern mass society is intriguing but cannot be further investigated here.

15. For the currently dominant framework called the five-factor model (which, incidentally, claims to be based on the notoriously weak ground of individual self-assessment), see Costa and McCrae (1987) and Goldberg (1993). Some researchers offer theories of intelligence types as scientifically superior to current theories of temperament, which they consider obsolete. Intelligence researchers are, however, far less restrained than temperament researchers in their enthusiasm for ever-proliferating types. H. Gardner (1983) became a classic by theorizing the existence of eight types of intelligence: linguistic, logical, spatial, bodily, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalist [*sic*].

16. A short but incisive rebuke of the conceptual framework of popular evolutionary psychology as represented, for example, by the work of Steven Pinker can be found in Shenk (2009).

17. Some commentators think this an indirect reference to Hölderlin's condition; others stress Hegel's uncomfortable familiarity with his sister's psychological frailness (see, e.g., Berthold-Bond 1995, 54). It is more likely, however, that Hegel would base his conceptualizations of forms of insanity on a wider evidentiary spectrum than his personal acquaintances.

18. Contrary to Petry, who reads *Freiheit von den beschränkten Interessen* as "freedom of having limited interests" (Hegel [1978], trans. Petry, 2:97), I read it as freedom *from* narrow-minded interests.

19. Notwithstanding Hegel's disapproval, in the German-speaking world of the early nineteenth century the Enlightenment's discovery of the developmental and educational importance of play continued to be propounded and defended by eminent personalities like Basedow, Pestalozzi, his student Fröbel, and Friedrich Schiller.

20. Hegel uses the medical term *Intussuszeption* (Lat. *intussusceptio*) to describe the rhythmic and targeted assimilation of the environment that is typical of animals but missing from plant life. The term *Intussuszeption* (English "invagination"), which is still used in medical texts, now denotes the intrusion of one tissue into another. Hegel's employment of this unusual terminology is one indication of the kind of literature he read in preparation for lecturing on the natural soul.

21. Note Hegel's use of "ideal" for this utterly physical conversion of lack into demand, or of hunger into voice. On the meaning of "idealism" in Hegel, see chapter 3, section 1.

22. In a metaphorical use, *Augenmass* is "intuitive judgment" or "approximate measuring."

23. Moscati (1771).

24. A synthesis of contemporary hypotheses on our ancestors' transition to daytime erect posture can be found in Niemitz (2010), 241–63.

25. In the *Philosophy of Spirit*, Hegel explicates his own uses of the Kantian terms "choice," "free choice," and "will" (*Willkür*, *freie Willkür*, and *Wille*) in the section on "Practical Spirit" of the "Psychology" (*PhS Enc* §§473–82).

26. On the superior endurance of human walking and slow running over those of all other animals, including the many that can outrun humans over short distances, see Bramble and Lieberman (2004), 345–52. "Persistence hunting" (slowly chasing a faster-running quadruped over several days until it collapses from fatigue) is still successfully practiced in some rural regions of Africa.

27. *Geschlecht* is the equivalent of "kin" or "kind," as in *Menschengeschlecht*, and hence encompasses both sexes and all transitional sexual types. The "gendered" use of the term, as in *weibliches* and *männliches Geschlecht* (female and male gender), which is more common today, is a narrowing of its generic meaning.

28. This is the translation by Nehamas and Woodruff (1997).

29. The political aspects of Aristophanes's speech focus, consistent with Athenian culture, on male homosexual pederasty, rather than adult homosexuality. In Athenian public opinion, when homosexuality involved equals in age or rank, it quickly became an object of contempt—it even carried the potential for legal charges. In the *Symposium* Aristophanes declares that the *erōmenoi* loved by adult *erastēs*, being "bold and brave and masculine . . . are the only kind of boys who grow up to be real men in politics" (*Symposium* 192a–b). The practices, juridical conceptions, and political uses of pederasty and homosexuality in classical Athens are well documented, among others, in Dover (1978). Hegel refers to ancient pederasty in an early aphorism (printed only in the first edition) of the so-called *Wastebook* (1803–6) by remarking, very perceptively: "the Greek love of boys is still little understood. There lies a precious disdain for women in it," followed by a more cryptic invocation of its alleged overcoming in Christianity: "and it hints at the fact that a God should be born anew" (Hegel [1803–6] 1968a, W 2:540). The history of the Roman Catholic Church, however, shows that the new institutionalized religion incorporated rather than overcame (sublated rather than elided) classical pedophilia.

30. Corrected from Nehamas' and Woodruff's "these people" to reflect the Greek word: *paiderastēs*.

31. Marsilio Ficino, *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis de Amore*, 1484, first edition (Ficino 1576).

32. The passage continues: "If women stand at the apex of government, the state is in peril . . . The education [*Bildung*] of women happens, one knows not how, as it were through the atmosphere of representational thinking, more through life than through the acquisition of cognitions, while the man obtains his status only through thought achievements and . . . technical efforts."

33. Hegel's criticism of Kant's contractarian conception of the domestic sphere is developed in *RPh* §§72–81 ("Contract") and §§158–81 ("Family"). For a critical discussion, see de Laurentiis (2000b) and Taylor (2013).

Chapter 6

This chapter adapts material that first appeared in "Sentience and Feeling in the Anthropology," in *The Palgrave Hegel Handbook*, ed. Marina F. Bykova and K. R. Westphal (New York: Palgrave, 2020), 297–315.

1. In the following, *Empfindung* is translated as "sentience" in order to emphasize its distinction from *Sensibilität* (sensibility), *Gefühl* (feeling), and, of course, *Wahrnehmung* (perception).

2. For a contemporary cosmological version of this principle, see Barrow and Tipler (1986), discussed above in note 22 of chapter 2.

3. Charles Darwin cautiously supported this parallelism. The most famous proponent of it became Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919).

4. See, for example, *Enc* §§392 Zus, 401 Zus, and, in the context of the *Encyclopaedia* "Phenomenology" ("Desire"), *PhS Enc* §426 Zus.

5. Hegel's division of the soul in these "moments" is a reelaboration of Leibniz's distinctions between the perceiving, sensing, and thinking monad.

6. This has been quoted above, chapter 2, section 3, to aid in the explication of the very first section of the *Anthropology*.

7. The passages from Aristotle's *Metaphysics* 1036b30–32 and *Da* II.1 412b18 to which this sentence refers are quoted in chapter 2, section 4, note 49.

8. In Hegel's use, abstractions are not mere mental operations, as already noted in chapter 5, section 1. There also exist real abstractions (*Realbastraktionen*), for example, the simplest specimens of a kind, or the simplifying, practical application of ideals to complex realities (such as, in Hegel's view, the Jacobins' attempts to impose *liberté, égalité, fraternité* on French historical reality). In the writings of the Young Hegelians, the notion of *Realbastraktion* would eventually play a major role. See, for example, Marx's analysis of "abstract" production as production for exchange-value alone, of "abstract" value as money, and of "abstract" labor as wage-labor in the *Grundrisse* (Marx [1857–58] 1983; Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 42:224–28). For a thorough treatment of Hegel's uses of the terms "abstract" and "concrete," see Inwood (1992).

9. The full passage from *Enc* §388 is given in chapter 2, section 3.

10. On *Empfindung* and *Gefühl* in Hegel, see the following helpful works: Höslé (1987); Wandschneider (1999) and (2010); Frigo (2002); de Vries (1988) (chapters 4 and 5) and (2013); Winfield (2007) and (2011) (chapters 5 and 6); Grier (2013); and Reid (2013).

11. On the related conception of weakly active and active monads in Leibniz, see Fouke (1991); de Fountenay (1998); Pasini (1994); and Fichant (2005).

12. Hegel's entelechistic characterization of *Seele* has been discussed already in chapter 1, section 2.

13. For Hegel's explicit references to the sentient soul as a "monadic individual," see *Enc* §405.

14. For Hegel's direct account of elasticity (mentioned above in connection with cohesion and sound), see in particular *PhN Enc* §297 and Zus.

15. See above chapter 2, section 4.

16. This fragment is part of an unfinished manuscript titled “Subjective Spirit” and dated to 1822.

17. Willem deVries (2003), 140, sheds helpful light on this passage and provides an improved translation.

18. This is discussed above in chapter 1, section 4, and in chapter 2, section 4.

19. This section refers exclusively to the 1830 *Encyclopaedia* text. On the significance of Hegel’s changes to the section “Feeling soul” between the 1827 and 1830 editions, see Stederoth (2001), 188–217; and Reid (2013).

20. Kant’s terse definition of madness makes use of a similar concept of derangement, albeit using a spatial rather than a temporal metaphor: madness sets in when the soul “becomes displaced . . . and finds itself outside the *sensorio communi* in a place far away from it: thus the word derangement [*Verrückung*]” (Kant 2000, 216).

21. Hegel’s equation of subjective spirit’s activities with “idealizations” has been discussed in chapters 3, section 1 and 5, section 3.

22. Leibniz’s *petites perceptions* (from the preface to the *Nouveaux Essays*, written 1704) greatly inspired the conceptions of the unconscious found in the works of Christian Wolff (1646–1716), Immanuel Kant, Ernst Platner (1744–1818), W. Goethe, F. Schelling, Carl Gustav Carus (1789–1869) and Gustav Theodor Fechner (1801–1887). In particular, Wolff, Kant, Platner, Carus and Fechner may be considered the originators of modern conceptions of “the unconscious” that would eventually climax in Sigmund Freud’s theories. Platner, Carus and Fechner (whom Freud cites in chapter 1 of *The Interpretation of Dreams*) were trained physiologists and medical researchers, which enabled them to understand consciousness and the unconscious in ways very similar to Hegel’s, namely as thoroughly psychosomatic conditions. A highly informative and thought-provoking collection of essays on pre-Freudian theories of the unconscious is Nicholls and Liebscher (2010).

23. At this abstract level, an “individual” is first and foremost a simple whole. See the definition of individuality in the *Science of Logic*’s “Doctrine of the Concept”: “Individuality . . . is *in and for itself the concrete principle of negative unity*, [and] *as such, itself totality*” (L W 6:426). The complete quote is discussed above in chapter 1, section 1.

24. The full description of the radically self-alienated spirit in the *Phenomenology*’s chapter 6, section B. I. a., is as follows: “It stands immediately over against this innermost precipice, against this bottomless depth, in which all foothold and substance have disappeared; and in this depth it sees nothing but a common thing, a play of its own whim, a happenstance of its caprice; its spirit aims at being wholly essence-less opinion, superficiality deserted by spirit” (*PhenG* W 3:384).

25. On the different meanings of the German word *Genius* and the English “genius,” see above, chapter 5, section 2. For *Genius* as used here by Hegel, see chapter 7, section 2.

26. On the meaning of “magic” in Hegel’s usage, see chapter 3, section 2, and chapter 7, section 2.

27. More on Pinel’s work in chapter 7. Philippe Pinel (1745–1826), a lifelong sympathizer of French revolutionary circles, served as head physician at the lunatic asylum La Salpêtrière. He is known for coining the expression “*aliénation*”

mentale” and for proposing and implementing therapies compatible with the *droits de l’homme* of the patients. Hegel admired him greatly and relied on his works (see *Enc* §408 Zus) for empirical and also for etiological material. In full Enlightenment mode, Pinel’s painstaking reports emphasize the extent to which individuals’ mental world may collapse in consequence of the breakdown of economic, social, and familial structures in times of foreign or civil war.

28. I cite Plato’s *Timaeus* from Jowett’s translation in Plato’s *Collected Dialogues* (Plato 1961).

Chapter 7

This chapter adapts material that first appeared in “Derangements of the Soul,” in *Hegel’s Philosophy of Spirit: A Critical Guide*, ed. Marina Bykova (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 83–103. Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSclear.

1. To this extent, Petry’s translation of *Selbstgefühl* as “self-awareness” (Hegel [1978], 2:323ff.) is fully justified. However, based on the possible psychologistic conflation of “self-awareness” with “self-consciousness,” “self-feeling” is the preferred term in what follows.

2. During Chiarugi’s lifetime the grand duke of Tuscany, Pietro Leopoldo, abolished torture and the death penalty. He also passed the first European laws for the protection of the insane (“Legge sui Pazzi”) in the duchy. Grange (1963) discusses the respective merits of both Pinel and Chiarugi in forging new public perceptions and scientific insights into the insane condition. Foucault’s criticism of Pinel is discussed below.

3. On Pinel’s writings and political activities, see Weiner (1992). On Chiarugi’s Cartesianism, French *Encyclopédie* leanings, and on Pinel’s criticism of Chiarugi, see F. M. Ferro’s introduction and G. Riefolo’s prefatory essay (“Uno spazio per la follia” [“A Space for Folly”]) in Chiarugi (1991). For a schematic comparison of Hegel’s and Pinel’s classifications of derangement, see Berthold-Bond (1995), 21.

4. Baglivi (1696).

5. See *Enc* §402 Zus, quoted in chapter 6, section 2.

6. For a brief history of psychophysical medical theory and practice through two millennia, see Veith (1965). It was only in 1952 that today’s notion of “conversion symptom,” borrowed from Freud, replaced “hysteria” in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual*.

7. The “depression” in question is meant as a “lowering” of mental life under the threshold of self-consciousness.

8. On the logical relation of singularity (*Einzelheit*) and particularity (*Besonderheit*), see the greater *Science of Logic*’s “Doctrine of the Concept,” *WdL W* 6:296–98; on its background in the history of logic, see Geraets, Suchting, and Harris (1991), xix–xx and xxx, n. 13; and Inwood (1992), 302–5.

9. See the quote in chapter 6, section 2.

10. On Mesmerism and magnetism in Hegel, see Magee (2001), 213ff., and (2013); and Berthold-Bond (1995), chapter 2. On Mesmerism as a social movement, see Crabtree (2016).

11. Berthold-Bond (1995), 87 and 170, identifies Hegel’s *Genius* only with the potential for evil, but see *Enc* §412 Zus.

12. Contemporary studies of “magic” theories and practices such as Schwemer (2015) and Hanegraaff (2016) fully adopt this core meaning of the term as formulated here by Hegel.

13. Hegel (1978), trans. Petry, 2:229.

14. Foucault (1961), especially chapter 9.

15. Pinel (1992).

16. Bleuler (1911).

17. See *DSM-5*, Introduction,” and the chapters on the “Schizophrenia Spectrum,” “Bipolar Disorder,” and “Personality Disorders.”

18. On the link between hypocrisy and criminal political action according to Kant and Hegel, see de Laurentiis (2016b).

19. The notation with double Greek letters follows that given in *W 10*; it corresponds to the numeration 1, 2, and 3 in Petry’s edition of the *Philosophy of “Subjective Spirit”* (Hegel [1978], trans. Petry).

20. Of particular interest in this respect is recent research into the traumatic behavior of individuals whose polities are subjected to rapid transitions from premodern (e.g., tribal) to modern (e.g., nation-state centered) structures. See, for example, Wichelt and Gryczynski (2012) on traumatic behavior among modern-day First Nation individuals in the Americas. In this study, the word “historical” plays a major role alongside the usual “social and political.” The authors’ approach could be defined as an “application” to a sociological case study of Hegel’s concept of catastrophic historical change and its impact on individual souls.

21. The passage continues: “The same effect is often brought about in the most dreadful way by religious causes, when a human being has sunk in absolute incertitude about whether he is being accepted by God’s grace.”

22. Not even fanaticism’s “fury of destruction” is pure evil for Hegel. The passage quoted contains the additional comment: “but Islamic fanaticism was simultaneously capable of all kinds of sublimity . . . free of petty interests, and joined to all virtues of magnanimity and valor.”

23. On this history, see Andrews et al. (1997).

24. Berthold-Bond (1995), 143–76, discusses in some detail the correspondence between madness and tragic figures in Hegel’s work.

Conclusion

1. For an overview, see Waszink (1980), 30.

2. On this history, see especially Testa (2008) and Menke (2012).

3. For the full passage, see the quote and discussion in chapter 1, section 1.

4. Blumenbach’s “natural domesticity” of man has been discussed in chapter 4, section 3.

5. Hegel’s reference is to *Enc* §401, which is discussed in chapter 6, section 2.

6. A full account of the debate, whose political undertones pivoted around the embrace or rejection of the biological kinship of humans and apes, is in Wells (1967).

7. See chapter 5, section 3 for a more thorough discussion of the upright stance and its connection to the natural will.

8. See chapter 1, section 4, and chapter 2, section 4.

9. A “power being released” (*freiwerdende Macht*) is not the same as a “liberating power” (*befreiende Macht*) as translated by Petry (Hegel 1978), 2:413.

By using the first formulation, Hegel designates the soul's power of idealizing, in principle, everything—the Aristotelian potential of the psyche “to think all things.” The release of this power is only the foundation for liberation; it signals the birth pangs of spirit as spirit.

10. In the Addition to section §411, the reference to Aristotle's *Da* III.8 is explicit: “the soul is analogous to the hand; for as the hand is a tool of tools, so mind is the form of forms and sense is the form of sensible things.” Hegel refers to the hand as “*Werkzeug der Werkzeuge*.”

11. For a most enlightening treatment of this distinction in Aristotle, see Balaban (1986).

12. The young Marx directly addresses the overcoming of the separation of *praxis* and *poiēsis* in his playful depiction of classless society, in which “it is possible for me . . . to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, herdsman or critic” (Marx and Engels [1845] 1978; Marx and Engels 1956–2018, 3:33).

13. *Geistig* (antonym of *physisch*) differs from *geistlich*, which has decidedly religious connotations. All human beings are *Geistwesen*, but only a few are *Geistliche* (men of the cloth), and none are *geistliche Wesen* (pure spirits).

14. Against persistent criticisms of Hegel's naive or Eurocentric mania for all things Greek, Walter Jaeschke has convincingly shown that for Hegel “spirit is not a beautiful thing, and the attempt to represent it as such belongs to a historical stage in which spirit still knows itself in unity with nature” (Jaeschke 2003, 433).

15. As in the related discussion in the 1807 *Phenomenology*, Hegel's reference here is to the followers of the eighteenth-century physiognomist and Zwinglian pastor Johann C. Lavater, as well as to the neuroanatomist Franz Joseph Gall.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackermann, Jacob F. 1797. *Versuch einer physischen Darstellung der Lebenskräfte organisirter Körper*. Frankfurt am Main.
- American Psychiatric Association. 2013. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5*. 5th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Andrews, Jonathan, Asa Briggs, Roy Porter, Penny Tucker, and Keir Waddington. 1997. *The History of Bethlem*. London: Routledge.
- Aquinas, Thomas. 1994. *Commentary on Aristotle's "De Anima."* Translated by Kenelm Foster, OP, and Sylvester Humphries, OP. South Bend, IN: Dumb Ox Books.
- Aristotle. 1590. *Aristotelis opera, quae extant et fragm.* Edited by Isaac Casaubon. Lyon: Guillelmum Laemarium.
- . 1831. *Aristoteles: Graece ex recensione Immanuelis Bekkeri*. Berlin: Georgium Reimerum.
- . 1848–49. *Aristotelis Metaphysica*. Edited by Hermann Bonitz. Bonnae: Marcus.
- . 1907. *Aristotle, De Anima*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1957. *Aristotelis Metaphysica*. Edited by Werner Jaeger. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1984a. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. 2 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1984b. *Metaphysics*. Translated by W. D. Ross. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, 2:1552–1728. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1984c. *On the Soul*. Translated by J. A. Smith. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, 1:641–692. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1984d. *Physics*. Translated by R. P. Hardie and R. K. Gaye. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, 1:315–446. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1984e. *Politics*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. In *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, 2:1986–2129. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1986. *De Anima (On the Soul)*. Translated by Hugh Lawson-Tancred. London: Penguin Books.
- . 2004. *Aristotle's "On the Soul" and "On Memory and Recollection."* Translated by Joe Sachs. Santa Fe: Green Lion.

- Asmuth, Christoph. 2016. "‘Die Seele ist dasselbe als ihre Leiblichkeit in sie eingebildet’: Leib und Seele bei Hegel." *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 72, no. 2–3: 281–98.
- Autenrieth, Hermann F. 1821. *Disquisitio Quaestionis Acad. de Discrimine Sexuali*. Tübingen.
- Autenrieth, Johann Heinrich Ferdinand, ed. 1801. *Handbuch der empirischen menschlichen Physiologie*. Tübingen: Jacob Friedrich Heerbrandt.
- Baglivi, Giorgio. 1696. *De praxi medica ad priscam observandi rationem ravo-canda*. Rome: Dominici Antonii Herculis.
- . 1704. *The Practice of Physick*. London: Andrew Bell.
- Balaban, Oded. 1986. "Aristotle's Theory of Praxis." *Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie* 114, no. 2: 163–72.
- Barbot, John. 1732. "A Description of the Coasts of North and South Guinea." In *Collection of Voyages and Travels*, edited by Thomas Astley and John Churchill. London.
- Barrow, John D., and Frank J. Tipler. 1988. *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baum, Manfred. 1992. "Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel: Geist und Seele in der Anthropologie Hegels." In *Philosophische Anthropologie im 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by F. Decher and J. Hennigfeld, 51–66. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Beiser, Frederick. 2005. *Hegel*. London: Routledge.
- Bernasconi, Robert. 1998. "Hegel at the Court of the Ashanti." In *Hegel after Derrida*, edited by Stuart Barnett, 41–63. London: Routledge.
- . 2000. "With What Must the Philosophy of World History Begin? On the Racial Basis of Hegel's Eurocentrism." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 22, no. 2: 171–201.
- . 2003. "Hegel's Racism: A Reply to McCarney." *Radical Philosophy* 119: 35–37.
- Bernasconi, Robert, and T. L. Lott, eds. 2000. *The Idea of Race*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Berthold-Bond, Daniel. 1995. *Hegel's Theory of Madness*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bichat, M. F. Xavier. 1799, 1805. *Recherches physiologiques sur la vie et la mort*. Paris: Brosson, Gabon et Cie.
- Bleuler, Eugen. 1911. *Dementia Praecox; oder, Gruppe der Schizophrenien*. Leipzig: Franz Deuticke.
- Blumenbach, Johann Friedrich. 1775. *De Generis Humani Varietate Nativa*. Göttingen: F. A. Rosenbusch.
- . 1790 and 1806. *Beyträge zur Naturgeschichte*. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- . (1865) 1969. *On the Natural Varieties of Mankind*. Translated by Thomas Bendyshe. New York: Bergman Publishers.
- Bodei, Remo. 1975. *Sistema ed epoca in Hegel*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bonetto, Sandra. 2006. "Race and Racism in Hegel—An Analysis." *Minerva—An Internet Journal of Philosophy* 10: 35–64.
- Bowman, Brady. 2013. *Hegel and the Metaphysics of Absolute Negativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bramble, Dennis M., and Daniel E. Lieberman. 2004. "Endurance Running and the Evolution of *Homo*." *Nature* 432: 345–52.
- Brandom, Robert B. 1998. *Making It Explicit: Reasoning, Representing, and Discursive Commitment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1999. "Some Pragmatist Themes in Hegel's Idealism: Negotiation and Administration in Hegel's Account of the Structure and Content of Conceptual Norms." *European Journal of Philosophy* 7, no. 2: 164–89.
- . 2002. *Tales of the Mighty Dead: Historical Essays in the Metaphysics of Intentionality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buchwalter, Andrew. 2009. "Is Hegel's Philosophy of History Eurocentric?" In *Hegel and History*, edited by Will Dudley, 87–110. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Buck-Morss, Susan. 2009. *Hegel, Haiti, and University History*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Buffon, Georges-Louis Leclerc. 1749–89. *Histoire naturelle, générale et particulière, avec la description du cabinet du Roi*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale.
- Chiarugi, Vincenzo. (1793–94) 1992. *Della pazzia in genere, e in specie: Trattato medico-analitico, con una centuria di osservazioni*. 3 vols. Florence: Carlieri.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. 2001. *On Moral Ends*. Translated by Raphael Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine. 2011. "Travel Regulations." In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism*, edited by Knut A. Jacobsen, Helene Basu, Angelika Malinar, and Vasudha Narayan, 3:203–7. Leiden: Brill.
- Cohen, Bruce J. 2003. *Theory and Practice of Psychiatry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crabtree, Adam. 2016. "Mesmer and Animal Magnetism." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Western Mysticism and Esotericism*, edited by Glenn Alexander Magee, 223–34. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- de Laurentiis, Allegra. 2000a. "Aristotle in the Nineteenth Century: The Case of Goethe's Study of Life." *Idealistic Studies* 30, no. 2: 107–19.
- . 2000b. "Kant's Shameful Proposition: A Hegel-Inspired Criticism of Kant's Theory of Domestic Right." *International Philosophical Quarterly* 40, no. 3: 297–312.
- . 2005a. "Metaphysical Foundations of the History of Philosophy: Hegel's 1820 Introduction to the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*." *Review of Metaphysics* 59: 3–31.
- . 2005b. *Subjects in the Ancient and Modern World: On Hegel's Theory of Subjectivity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2006. "The *Parmenides* and *De Anima* in Hegel's Perspective." *Bulletin of the Hegel Society of Great Britain* 53–54: 51–68.
- . 2007. "Not Hegel's Tales: Applied Concepts, Negotiated Truths, and the Reciprocity of Un-equals in Conceptual Pragmatism." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 33, no. 1: 83–98.
- . 2009. "Absolute Knowing." In *The Blackwell Guide to Hegel's "Phenomenology of Spirit"*, edited by Kenneth R. Westphal, 246–64. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- . 2012–14. "Hylemorphism and Hegel's Account of the Soul." *Jahrbuch für Hegelforschung* 18–20: 247–65.

- , ed. 2013. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Hegel*. Coedited with Jeffrey Edwards. London: Bloomsbury.
- . 2014. "Race in Hegel: Text and Context." In *Philosophie nach Kant: Neue Wege zum Verständnis von Kants Transzendental- und Moralphilosophie*, edited by Mario Egger, 591–624. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- , ed. 2016a. *Hegel and Metaphysics: On Logic and Ontology in the System*. With the collaboration of Søren Whited. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 2016b. "Rights-Pragmatism and the Right of Humanity: International Politics in Kant's and Hegel's Perspectives." *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie* 102, no. 1: 22–39.
- . 2018. "The Aristotelian Metaphysics of Hegel's 'Soul.'" In *Hegel and Ancient Philosophy: A Re-Examination*, edited by Glenn Alexander Magee, 115–31. New York: Routledge.
- . 2019. "Derangements of the Soul." In *Hegel's Philosophy of Spirit: A Critical Guide*, edited by Marina F. Bykova, 83–103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2020. "Sentience and Feeling in the Anthropology." In *The Palgrave Hegel Handbook*, edited by Marina F. Bykova and Kenneth R. Westphal, 297–315. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Descartes, René. 1964–. *Oeuvres de Descartes*. Edited by Charles Adam and Paul Tannery. Paris: L. Cerf. Citations of this collected edition in text are abbreviated as AT.
- deVries, Willem A. 1988. *Hegel's Theory of Mental Activity: An Introduction to Theoretical Spirit*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- . 2013. "Subjective Spirit: Soul, Consciousness, Intelligence, and Will." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Hegel*, edited by Allegra de Laurentiis and Jeffrey Edwards, 133–56. London: Bloomsbury.
- Diamond, Eli. 2015. *Mortal Imitations of Divine Life: The Nature of the Soul in Aristotle's "De Anima"*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Diels, Hermann A., and Walther Kranz. 1903. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Dohm, Christian Wilhelm von. 1781. *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden*. Berlin: Friedrich Nicolai. <http://www.ub.uni-bielefeld.de/diglib/dohm/ueber>.
- Dover, K. J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1994. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- D'Souza, Dinesh. 1995. *The End of Racism: Principles for a Multiracial Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Dudley, Will. 2013. "The Active Fanaticism of Political and Religious Life: Hegel on Terror and Islam." In *Hegel on Religion and Politics*, edited by Angelica Nuzzo, 119–32. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Düsing, Klaus. 1983. *Hegel und die Geschichte der Philosophie: Ontologie und Dialektik in Antike und Neuzeit*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- . 1986. "Sylogistik und Dialektik in Hegels spekulativer Logik." In *Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik: Formation und Rekonstruktion*, edited by Dieter Henrich, 15–38. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

- . 2001. *Hegel e l'antichità classica*. Edited by Salvatore Giammusso. Naples: La Città del Sole.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1884. *Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums, und des Staats*. Hottingen-Zürich: Schweizerische Volksbuchhandlung.
- Euler, Leonhard. 1802. *Letters of Euler on Different Subjects in Physics and Philosophy: Addressed to a German Princess*. Translated by Henry Hunter. 2 vols. London: Murray and Highley. <https://archive.org/details/letterseulertoa00eulegoog>.
- Falconer, William. 1781. *Remarks on the Influence of Climate, Situation, Nature of Country, Population, Nature of Food, and Way of Life, on the Disposition and Temper, Manners and Behaviour, Intellectuals, Laws and Customs, Form of Government, and Religion, of Mankind*. London: C. Dilly.
- Ferrarin, Alfredo. 2001. *Hegel and Aristotle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fichant, Michel. 2005. "La Constitution du concept de monade." In *La monadologie de Leibniz: Genèse et context*, edited by Enrico Pasini, 31–54. Milan: Mimesis.
- Ficino, Marsilio. 1576. *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis, de amore* (1484). In *Platonis Opera Omnia*. Basel.
- Findlay, J. N. 1958. *Hegel: A Re-Examination*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Foucault, Michel. 1961. *Folie et déraison: Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique*. Paris: Plon.
- Fouke, Daniel Clifford. 1991. "Spontaneity and the Generation of Rational Beings in Leibniz's Theory of Biological Reproduction." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 29, no. 1: 33–45.
- Frigo, Gianfranco. 2002. "Die Welt der Lebenden Natur bei Hegel." In *Hegel und die Lebenswissenschaften*, edited by Olaf Breidbach and Dietrich von Engelhardt, 107–20. Berlin: Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung.
- Gardner, Howard. 1983. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, Martin. 1986. "WAP, SAP, PAP, & FAP." Review of *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, by John D. Tipler and Frank J. Tipler. *New York Review of Books*, May 8, 22–25.
- German, Andy. 2018. "Mens Divina as Lebendigkeit: Hegel's Interpretation of Metaphysics 1072b26–27." In *Hegel and Ancient Philosophy: A Re-Examination*, edited by Glenn Alexander Magee, 86–102. New York: Routledge.
- Giladi, Paul. 2016. "Hegel's Metaphysics as Speculative Naturalism." In *Hegel and Metaphysics: On Logic and Ontology in the System*, edited by Allegra de Laurentiis, 149–62. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gobineau, Joseph Arthur de. 1853. *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*. Paris: Firmin-Didot.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. 1856. *Faust: A Tragedy*. Translated by Charles T. Brooks. Boston: Ticknor and Fields.
- . 1987–2013. *Sämtliche Werke: Briefe, Tagebücher und Gespräche*. 40 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Goldberg, Lewis R. 1993. "The Structure of Phenotypic Personality Traits." *American Psychologist* 48, no. 1: 26–34.

- Gould, Stephen Jay. 1996. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Grange, Kathleen M. 1963. "Pinel or Chiarugi?" *Medical History* 7, no. 4: 371–80.
- Grier, Philip T. 2013. "The Relation of Mind to Nature: Two Paradigms." In *Essays on Hegel's "Philosophy of Subjective Spirit,"* edited by David S. Stern, 223–46. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Grimm, Jacob, and Wilhelm Grimm. 1854–1961. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm*. 16 vols. Leipzig: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Haeckel, Ernst. 1868. *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte: Gemeinverständliche wissenschaftliche Vorträge über die Entwicklungslehre im Allgemeinen und diejenige von Darwin, Goethe, und Lamarck im Besondern*. Berlin: G. Reimer.
- . 1899. *Die Welträthsel: Gemeinverständliche Studien über monistische Philosophie*. Stuttgart: A. Kröner.
- Hanegraaff, Wouter J. 2016. "Magic." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Western Mysticism and Esotericism*, edited by Glenn Alexander Magee, 393–404. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harman, Gilbert. 1973. *Thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Harris, Errol E. 1954. *Nature, Mind, and Modern Science*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- . 1991. *Cosmos and Anthropos: A Philosophical Interpretation of the Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.
- Harris, H. S. 1997. *Hegel's Ladder*. 2 vols. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Hartmann, Klaus. 1972. "Hegel: A Non-Metaphysical View." In *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Alasdair MacIntyre. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1803–6) 1986a. "Aphorismen aus Hegels Wastebook (1803–06)." In *Jenaer Schriften 1801–1807*, 540–67. Vol. 2 of *Werke in 20 Bänden*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1952a. *Hegel's "Philosophy of Right."* Translated by T. M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1952b. *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. Edited by Johannes Hoffmeister. Hamburg: Meiner.
- . 1968–. *Gesammelte Werke*. 25 vols. Hamburg: Meiner.
- . 1970. *Hegel's "Philosophy of Nature."* Edited and translated by M. J. Petry. 3 vols. London: Allen and Unwin.
- . 1971. *Hegel's Philosophy of Mind: Being Part Three of the "Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences."* Translated by William Wallace and A. V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1975. *Hegel's Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Translated by T. M. Knox. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1977. *Hegel's "Phenomenology of Spirit."* Translated by A. V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1978. *Hegel's "Philosophy of Subjective Spirit."* Edited and translated by M. J. Petry. 3 vols. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- . 1986b. *Werke in 20 Bänden*. 20 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- . 1991. *The Encyclopaedia Logic: Part I of the Encyclopaedia of Philosophical Sciences with the Zusätze*. Translated by T. F. Geraets, W. A. Suchting, and H. S. Harris. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- . 1994. *Vorlesung über die Philosophie des Geistes: Berlin, 1827–1828*. Edited by Franz Hesse and Burkhard Tuschling. Hamburg: Meiner.
- . 2009. *Lectures on the History of Philosophy: 1825–6*. Vol. 1, *Introduction and Oriental Philosophy*, edited by Robert F. Brown, translated by R. F. Brown and J. M. Stewart. With the assistance of H. S. Harris. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2010. *The Science of Logic*. Edited and translated by George di Giovanni. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2018a. *Hegel's "Phenomenology of Spirit"*. Translated by Terry Pinkard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2018b. *Hegel: The Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Michael Inwood. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 2003. *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)*. Edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Vol. 65 of *Heidegger Gesamtausgabe*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975–.
- . 2006. *Identität und Differenz*. Edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann. Vol. 11 of *Heidegger Gesamtausgabe*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975–.
- Heine, Heinrich. 1833. *Zur Geschichte der neueren schönen Literatur in Deutschland*. Paris: Heideloff and Campe.
- Herodotus. 1954. *Herodotus: The Histories*. Translated by Aubrey de Sélincourt. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.
- Hoffheimer, Michael H. 2001. "Hegel, Race, Genocide." In "The Contemporary Relevance of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*," ed. Tom Nenon. Special issue, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 39, no. 1: 35–62.
- Hoffman, Paul. 1986. "The Unity of Descartes' Man." *Philosophical Review* 95, no. 3: 339–70.
- Hölderlin, Friedrich. (1795) 1962. "Urtheil und Seyn." In *Hölderlin Sämtliche Werke*, edited by F. Beissner, 4:226–28. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Home, Henry, Lord Kames. 1775. *Sketches of the History of Man*. 4 vols. Dublin: United Company of Booksellers.
- Hösle, Vittorio. 1987. "Pflanze und Tier." In *Hegel und die Naturwissenschaften*, edited by Michael John Petry, 377–422. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.
- . 2006. "Platonism and Its Interpretations: The Three Paradigms and Their Place in the History of Hermeneutics." In *Eriugena, Berkeley, and the Idealist Tradition*, edited by Stephen Gersh and Dermot Moran, 54–80. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Houlgate, Stephen. 2005. *An Introduction to Hegel: Freedom, Truth and History*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Hume, David. 1779. *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*. London.
- Hunt, James. 1863. "On Ethno-Climatology; or, The Acclimatization of Man." *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London* 2:50–83.
- . 1863. "Introductory Address on the Study of Anthropology." *Anthropological Review* 1, no. 1: 1–20.

- . 1864. "On the Negro's Place in Nature." *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London* 2: xv–lvi.
- . 1867. "Anniversary Address, Delivered before the Anthropological Society of London" *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London* 7: lxi–lxii.
- Inwood, Michael J. 1983. *Hegel*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- . 1992. *A Hegel Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2013. "Logic-Nature-Spirit." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Hegel*, edited by Allegra de Laurentiis and Jeffrey Edwards, 205–8. London: Bloomsbury.
- Junker, Thomas. 1998. "Blumenbach's Racial Geometry." *Isis: A Journal of the History of Science Society* 89, no. 3: 498–501.
- Justi, Johann Heinrich Gottlob von. 1760. *Die Natur und das Wesen der Staaten, als die Grundwissenschaft der Staatskunst, der Policey, und aller Regierungswissenschaften, dergleichen als die Quelle aller Gesetze*. Berlin: Johann Heinrich Rüdiger.
- Kamen, Henry. 1997. *The Spanish Inquisition: A Historical Revision*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1962. *Logik*. In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 9 [AA 9], *Logik, Physische Geographie, Pädagogik*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1963. *Kritik der Urteilskraft*. In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 5 [AA 5], *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, Kritik der Urteilskraft*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1969a. "Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen." In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 2 [AA 2], *Vorkritische Schriften II: 1757–1777*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1969b. "Bestimmung des Begriffs einer Menschenrace." In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 8 [AA 8], *Abhandlungen nach 1781*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1969c. "Recension von Moscatis Schrift: Von dem körperlichen wesentlichen Unterschiede zwischen der Structur der Thiere und Menschen." In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 2 [AA 2], *Vorkritische Schriften II: 1757–1777*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1969d. "Versuch den Begriff der negative Größen in die Weltweisheit einzuführen." In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 2 [AA 2], *Vorkritische Schriften II: 1757–1777*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1969e. "Versuch über die Krankheiten des Kopfes." In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 2 [AA 2], *Vorkritische Schriften II: 1757–1777*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1969f. "Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen." In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 2 [AA 2], *Vorkritische Schriften II: 1757–1777*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1969g. *Zum ewigen Frieden*. In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 8 [AA 8]. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 1976. "Gedanken von der wahren Schätzung der lebendigen Kräfte." In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 1 [AA 1], *Vorkritische Schriften I: 1747–1756*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- . 2000. *Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht*. In *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 7 [AA 7], *Der Streit der Fakultäten. Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

- Koch, Anton F. 2007. "Die schlechte Metaphysik der Dinge: Metaphysik als immanente Metaphysikkritik bei Hegel." *Internationales Jahrbuch des Deutschen Idealismus* 5:189–210.
- . 2010. "Aristoteles und Hegel." In *Eduard Zeller: Philosophie- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by Gerald Hartung. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kosman, Aryeh. 2013. *The Activity of Being: An Essay on Aristotle's Ontology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kretschmer, Ernst. 1931. *The Psychology of Men of Genius*. London: Routledge.
- Lamarck, Jean-Baptiste. 1809. *Philosophie zoologique*. Paris: Dentu.
- La Mettrie, Julien Offroy de. 1994. "Man a Machine" and "Man a Plant." Translated by Richard Watson and Maya Rybalka. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Lane, George. 2006. *Daily Life in the Mongol Empire*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Leibniz, G. W. 1982. *New Essays on Human Understanding*. Edited and translated by Peter Remnant and Jonathan Bennett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linnaeus, Carl. (1735) 1758. *Systema Naturae*. Leiden: Haak.
- Loewenstein, Werner R. 1999. *The Touchstone of Life: Molecular Information, Cell Communication, and the Foundations of Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Magee, Glenn Alexander. 2001. *Hegel and the Hermetic Tradition*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- . 2010. *The Hegel Dictionary*. London: Continuum.
- . 2013. "The Dark Side of Subjective Spirit: Hegel on Mesmerism, Madness, and Ganglia." In *Essays on Hegel's "Philosophy of Subjective Spirit"*, edited by David S. Stern, 55–70. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Manning, Gideon. 2013. "The History of 'Hylomorphism.'" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 74, no. 2: 173–87.
- Martineau, James. 1888. *A Study of Religion: Its Sources and Contents*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Marx, Karl. 1961. "Lohnarbeit und Kapital." In *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke*, 6:397–423. Berlin: Dietz.
- . 1962a. *Das Kapital: Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*. Vol. 1, *Der Produktionsprozeß des Kapitals* (1867). Vol. 23 of *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke*. Berlin: Dietz.
- . 1962b. "Über P.-J. Proudhon. Brief an J. B. v. Schweitzer." In *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke*, 16:25–32. Berlin: Dietz.
- . 1968. "Geld." In *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke*, 40:562–67. Berlin: Dietz.
- . 1972. *Das Elend der Philosophie: Antwort auf Proudhon's "Philosophie des Elends"*. In *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke*, 4:63–182. Berlin: Dietz.
- . (1843) 1981. "Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie: Einleitung." In *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke*, 1:378–91. Berlin: Dietz.
- . (1857–58) 1983. *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Oekonomie (1857–58)*. Vol. 42 of *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke*. Berlin: Dietz.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. (1845) 1978. *Die deutsche Ideologie*. In *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke*, 3:9–532. Berlin: Dietz.

- . *Karl Marx Friedrich Engels Werke (Marx-Engels-Werke)*. 1956–2018. 44 vols. Berlin: Karl Dietz Verlag.
- McCarney, Joseph. 2003. "Hegel's Racism? A Response to Bernasconi." *Radical Philosophy* 119: 32–35.
- McCrae, Robert R., and Paul T. Costa. 1987. "Validation of the Five-Factor Model of Personality across Instruments and Observers." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52, no. 1: 81–90.
- Menke, Christoph. 2012. "Zweite Natur, Kritik und Affirmation." In ". . . wenn die Stunde es zulässt": *Zur Traditionalität und Aktualität kritischer Theorie*, edited by Mark Lückhof, David Nax, Oliver Römer, Sebastian Schreull, Christian Spiegelberg, and Malte Völk, 154–71. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- Menn, Stephen. 2010. "Zeller and the Debates about Aristotle's *Metaphysics*." In *Eduard Zeller: Philosophie- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by Gerald Hartung, xxx–xxx. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1945. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Mesmer, Franz Anton. 1766. *De Planetarum Influx in Corpus Humanum: Dissertatio Physico-Medica*. Vienna.
- Meyer-Abich, Adolph. 1961. "Biologie." In *Goethe-Handbuch: Goethe, seine Welt und Zeit in Werk und Wirkung*, edited by A. Zastra, vol. 1. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- Michael, John S. 2017. "Nuance Lost in Translation: Interpretations of J. F. Blumenbach's Anthropology in the English-Speaking World." *NTM: Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin / Journal of the History of Science, Technology and Medicine* 25, no. 3: 281–309.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1877. *Ancient Society; or, Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery, through Barbarism, to Civilization*. London: Macmillan.
- Morris, Rosalind C., Daniel H. Leonard, and Charles de Brosses. 2017. *The Returns of Fetishism: Charles de Brosses and the Afterlives of an Idea*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morton, Samuel George. 1839. *Crania Americana; or, A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America*. Philadelphia: J. Dobson.
- Moscatti, Pietro. 1771. *Delle corporee differenze essenziali che passano fra la struttura de' bruti, e la umana*. Brescia: Giammaria Rizzardi.
- Mowad, Nicholas. 2019. *Meaning and Embodiment: Human Corporeity in Hegel's Anthropology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Nasti De Vincentis, Mauro. 1991. "Hegel's Worm in Newton's Apple." In *Hegel and the Philosophy of Nature*, edited by Stephen Houlgate. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Neugebauer, Christian. 1990. "The Racism of Hegel and Kant." In *Sage Philosophy: Indigenous Thinkers and Modern Debate on African Philosophy*, edited by Odera Oruka. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nicholls, Angus, and M. Liebscher, eds. 2010. *Thinking the Unconscious. Nineteenth-Century German Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- Niemitz, Carsten. 2010. "The Evolution of the Upright Posture and Gait—A Review and a New Synthesis." *Naturwissenschaften* 97, no. 3: 241–63.
- Nuzzo, Angelica. 2004. "Hegels Auffassung der Philosophie als System und die drei Schlüsse der *Enzyklopädie*." In *Hegels enzyklopädisches System der Philosophie*, edited by Hans-Christian Lucas, Burkhard Tuschling, and Ulrich Vogel, 459–80. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.
- . 2013. "Anthropology, *Geist*, and the Soul-Body Relation: The Systematic Beginning of Hegel's *Philosophy of Spirit*." In *Essays on Hegel's "Philosophy of Subjective Spirit"*, edited by David S. Stern, 1–18. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Parekh, Sūrya. 2009. "Hegel's New World: History, Freedom, and Race." In *Hegel and History*, edited by Will Dudley, 111–34. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pasini, Enrico. 1994. "Perception, Imagination, and Leibniz's Theory of the Will." In *Leibniz und Europa: VI. Internationaler Leibniz-Kongreß; Vorträge I. Teil*, 581–88. Hannover: Gottfried-Wilhelm-Leibniz-Gesellschaft.
- Peperzak, Adriaan. 1987. *Selbsterkenntnis des Absoluten: Grundlinien der Hegelschen Philosophie des Geistes*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Pesch, Tilman. 1877. "Die Teleologie in der mittelalterlichen Naturphilosophie." In *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 12:357–76 and 509–28. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung.
- . 1880. *Institutiones Philosophiae Naturalis Secundum Principia S. Thomae Aquinatis*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung.
- Pinel, Philippe. 1801. *Traité medico-philosophique sur l'aliénation mentale: ou, La manie*. Paris: Richard, Caille et Ravier.
- . 1992. "Mémorial on Madness: A Contribution to the Natural History of Man (Dec. 11, 1794)." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 149, no. 6: 728–32.
- Pinkard, Terry. 1994. *Hegel's Phenomenology: The Sociality of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2012. *Hegel's Naturalism: Mind, Nature, and the Final Ends of Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pippin, Robert B. 1989. *Hegel's Idealism: The Satisfactions of Self-Consciousness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Platner, Ernst. 1772. *Anthropologie für Aerzte und Weltweise*. Leipzig: Dyck.
- Plato. 1544. *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis, de Amore*. Translated into Latin by Marsilio Ficino. Florence: Néri Dordelata.
- . 1961. *Timaëus*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. In *Plato: Collected Dialogues; Including the Letters*, edited by Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, 1151–1211. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 1997. *Symposium*. Translated by Alexander Nehamas and Paul Woodruff. In *Plato: Complete Works*, edited by John M. Cooper, 457–505. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. 1923. *Système des contradictions économiques; ou, Philosophie de la misère (1846)*. In *Proudhon, P.-J., 1809–1865*, edited by C. C. A. Bouglé. Paris: M. Rivière.
- Putnam, Hilary. 1981. *Reason, Truth and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rainger, Ronald. 1978. "Race, Politics, and Science: The Anthropological Society of London in the 1860s." *Victorian Studies* 22, no. 1: 51–70.
- Redding, Paul. 2007. *Analytic Philosophy and the Return of Hegelian Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reid, Jeffrey. 2013. "How the Dreaming Soul Became the Feeling Soul, between the 1827 and 1830 Editions of Hegel's *Philosophy of Subjective Spirit*: Empirical Psychology and the Late Enlightenment." In *Essays on Hegel's "Philosophy of Subjective Spirit"*, edited by David S. Stern, 37–54. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Renschler, Emily S., and Janet Monge. 2008. "The Samuel George Morton Cranial Collection." *Expedition* 50, no. 3: 30–38.
- Ringel, Shoshana, and Jerrold R. Brandell, eds. 2012. *Trauma: Contemporary Directions in Theory, Practice, and Research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (1762) 1943. *Du Contrat Social, avec une introduction, des notes et un commentaire par Maurice Halbwachs*. Aubier: Éditions Montaigne.
- . 1993. *The Social Contract and the Discourses*. Translated by G. D. H. Cole. Revised and augmented by J. H. Brumfitt and John C. Hall. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Schick, Friedrike. 2006. "Schluss." In *Hegel-Lexikon*, edited by Paul Cobben, Paul Cruysberghs, Peter Jonkers, and Lu De Vos, 394–96. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Schleicher, August. 1861–62. *Compendium der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. 2 vols. Weimar: H. Böhlau.
- Schneider, Helmut. 1972. "Unveröffentlichte Vorlesungsmanuskripte Hegels." *Hegel-Studien* 7: 9–60.
- Schwemer, Daniel. 2015. "The Ancient Near East." In *The Cambridge History of Magic and Witchcraft in the West: From Antiquity to the Present*, edited by David J. Collins, SJ, 17–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shields, Christopher. 2016. "Aristotle's Psychology." In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2016 Edition. Article published January 11, 2000. Substantive revision January 8, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-psychology/>.
- Simondon, Gilbert. 2005. *L'Individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information*. Grenoble: Éditions Jérôme Millon.
- Stederoth, Dirk. 2001. *Hegels Philosophie des subjektiven Geistes: Ein komparativer Kommentar*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Stern, David S., ed. 2013. *Essays on Hegel's "Philosophy of Subjective Spirit"*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Stern, Robert. 2009. *Hegelian Metaphysics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, Michael Thomas. 2013. "Right Queer: Hegel's Philosophy of Marriage." *Republic of Letters: A Journal for the Study of Knowledge, Politics, and the Arts* 3, no. 2. <http://arcade.stanford.edu/rofl/right-queer-hegel's-philosophy-marriage>.
- Testa, Italo. 2008. "Selbstbewußtsein und zweite Natur." In *Hegels "Phänomenologie des Geistes": Ein kooperativer Kommentar zu einem Schlüsselwerk der Moderne*, edited by Klaus Vieweg and Wolfgang Welsch, 286–307. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- . 2013a. "Hegel's Naturalism of Soul and Body in the *Encyclopedia*." In *Essays on Hegel's "Philosophy of Subjective Spirit"*, edited by David S. Stern, 19–36. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . 2013b. "Scepsis and Scepticism." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Hegel*, edited by Allegra de Laurentiis and Jeffrey Edwards, 273–78. London: Bloomsbury.
- Thompson, Kevin. 2013. "Hegel, the Political, and the Theological: The Question of Islam." In *Hegel on Religion and Politics*, edited by Angelica Nuzzo, 99–118. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Thompson, William. 1824. *Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth Most Conducive to Human Happiness: Applied to the Newly Proposed System of Voluntary Equality of Wealth*. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green.
- Treviranus, Gottfried Reinhold. 1802. *Biologie; oder Philosophie der lebenden Natur für Naturforscher und Ärzte*. Göttingen: Röwer.
- Veith, Ilza. 1965. *Hysteria: The History of a Disease*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wachsmut, Andreas B. 1963. *J. W. Goethe: Schriften zur Botanik und Wissenschaftslehre*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Waibel, Violetta. 1997. "Wechselbestimmung: Zum Verhältnis von Hölderlin, Schiller und Fichte in Jena." *Fichte-Studien* 12: 43–69.
- . 2002. "Kant, Fichte, Schelling." In *Hölderlin Handbuch: Leben-Werk-Wirkung*, edited by Johann Kreuzer, 90–106. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- Wandschneider, Dieter. 1999. "Das Problem der Emergenz von Psychischem—im Anschluss an Hegels Theorie der Empfindung." In *Jahrbuch für Philosophie des Forschungsinstituts für Philosophie Hannover*, edited by Vittorio Hösle, Peter Koslowski, and Richard Schenk, 10:69–95. Vienna: Passagen Verlag.
- . 2010. "Elementare Formen des Psychischen: Eine Systemtheoretische Skizze im Anschluss an Hegels Deutung des Organismus." In *Bewusstsein zwischen Natur und Geist*, edited by Wolfgang Neuser and Wolfgang Lenski, 1–27. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Waszink, Jan Hendrik. 1980. "Die Vorstellungen von der 'Ausdehnung der Natur' in der griechisch-römischen Antike und im frühen Christentum." In *Pietas: Festschrift für B. Kötting: Jahrbuch Antike Christentum, Ergänzungsband* 8:30–38. Münster: Aschendorff Verlag.
- Weatherford, Jack. 2004. *Genghis Khan and the Making of the Modern World*. New York: Three Rivers.
- Weiner, Dora B. 1992. "Philippe Pinel's 'Memoir on Madness' of December 11, 1794: A Fundamental Text of Modern Psychiatry." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 149, no. 6: 725–28.
- Wells, George A. 1967. "Goethe and the Inter Maxillary Bone." *British Journal for the History of Science* 3, no. 4: 348–61.
- Westphal, Kenneth R., ed. 2009. *The Blackwell Guide to Hegel's "Phenomenology of Spirit"*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- White, Charles. 1799. *An Account of the Regular Gradation in Man, and in Different Animals and Vegetables, and from the Former to the Latter*. London: C. Dilly.

- Wichelt, Shelly A., and Jan Gryczynski. 2012. "Cultural and Historical Trauma among Native Americans." In *Trauma: Contemporary Directions in Theory, Practice, and Research*, edited by Shoshana Ringel and Jerrold R. Brandell, 191–222. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Willoughby, Christopher Daniel. 2010. "Naturally Degraded: How Racism Impacted Politics in the Late Antebellum South." *Journal of the South Carolina Medical Association* 106, no. 4: 169–76.
- Winfield, Richard Dien. 2007. "Identity, Difference, and the Unity of Mind: Reflections on Hegel's Determination of Psyche, Consciousness, and Intelligence." In *Identity and Difference: Studies in Hegel's Logic, Philosophy of Spirit, and Politics*, edited by Philip T. Grier, 103–27. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . 2010. *Hegel and Mind: Rethinking Philosophical Psychology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2011. *The Living Mind: From Psyche to Consciousness*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Wolff, Michael. 1992. *Das Körper-Seele-Problem: Kommentar zu Hegel, "Enzyklopädie" (1830), § 389*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
- . 2013. "Science of Logic." In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Hegel*, edited by Allegra de Laurentiis and Jeffrey Edwards, 71–102. London: Bloomsbury.
- Wolpoff, Milford, and Rachel Caspari. 2007. *Race and Human Evolution: A Fatal Attraction*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Wood, Allen W. 1990. *Hegel's Ethical Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaryab, Rahanward. 2019. "The Hawk and the Tree." Translated by Wasef Bakhtari. *Afghan Magazine*, April 13. <https://afghanmagazine.com/post/184169642344/the-hawk-and-the-tree>.

INDEX

- actuality: and concept, 44–45, 187–88; as final stage of soul, 1–2, 182, 183, 187–89, 191; and natural spirit, 190; and Idea, 12; logic of, xi; metaphysical dimensions, xiii; and the real, 8
- additions to *Anthropology*: range of, 3–5; transcribers' roles in, xiv, xvi, 1, 57–58, 70, 110, 155
- Africa: climate of, 91; geological features of, 80
- African peoples: accomplishments and capacities of, 89–90; enslavement of, 7, 90, 204n12; founding of Haiti by, 80–81; Hegel's commentaries on, 70, 71–72, 73–74; religion of, 74, 80, 204n11; soul of, 80; and Spain, 101
- Agassiz, Louis, 94
- age: bourgeois models of, 115–17; phases in, 144–16; and species, 113–14; as time-dependent change in individual, 112–13
- agency: Aristotelian, 184–85; public vs. private, 167–68
- American Civil War, 96
- Anaxagoras: and hylomorphism, 15; on *nous*, xvi; on unity of nature and spirit, 63–64, 66
- androgyny, 122, 127
- animal: archetypal, 35, 40; change and, 112; in educational process, 114; human, 1, 104, 114, 181; life and, 1; magnetism and, 4, 5, 159–61; motion and, 25; vs. plant, 136, 138–39, 208n20; sentience of, 133; sleeping and waking of, 127, 136; soul and, xiii, xv; as term, 9; two-leggedness and, 118–20
- Anthropological Society of London, 95–96
- Anthropology* division, *Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences* (Hegel): Additions to (*see* Additions to *Anthropology*); closing sections of, 182; coherence of, 5–6; dialectical movement in, 190–91; editions of, xiv, 7–8; in Hegel's philosophical system, xi–xiii, 5–9, 190–91; historical-scientific matter in, xii; idealism in, 66–67; opening section of, 43–46; overall goal of, 27–29; place in the *Encyclopedia*, xv, 7–8; style and structure of, 3–5; subject matter of, 1–3, 129, 146; as theory of becoming of anthropic soul, xiv–xv; translations of, xiv, 6, 45–46, 203n2
- anthropology, contemporary: and bipedalism, 119; physical, 181; and race, 78, 97–98
- Aphorisms* (Goethe), xvi
- Aquinas, Thomas, on four temperaments, 109
- Arab peoples, Hegel's commentaries on, 82, 205n20
- Aristotle: entelechism of, xv, 15, 38, 50, 187–88; embodiment hypotheses and, 23; on family, 126; Goethe and, 33–35, 36–37; on habituation, 177–78; Hegel and, 1, 9, 51; on hyloplomorphic soul, xiii, xv, 14–17, 199n28; on living body, 25–26, 49; on matter, 55; metaphysics of, 9, 13–14, 24–28; and morphology, 33, 197n8; on *noēsis* (speculative thinking), 54, 200n45; on *noūs* (intellect), 51–52, 186, 199n35; on *poiēsis* (action in view of a product) vs. *praxis* (action for its own sake), 184–85; on *psuchē* (psyche) 3, 9, 14–17, 49–52, 196n21; on sleeping and waking, 133–36; on soul as

- Aristotle (*continued*)
 substance, 68; on soul unmixed with body, 183; on *to sunolon* (unity), 13–14, 15, 130–31
- Aristotelianism: *empsychon* in, 130–31; Goethe and, 33–37, 38–39, 197n16; on happiness, 164; holism of, 20–21; “inferior” and “superior” categories in, 74; on living body, 49–51; on metaphysics of substance, 13–14; ontology in, 23; on productive activity, 184–85
- asceticism: as form or derangement, 173–74; as psychophysical skill, xx; and self-feeling, 149
- Asclepian medicine, humoral doctrine of, xviii, 109
- Asia, geophysical features of 81
- Asian peoples, Hegel’s commentaries on, 70, 81, 204n17
- astrology, and Mesmerism, 159
- Augustine, on four temperaments, 109
- ausarten/Ausartung* terms, misleading translation of, 89, 91–93
- Baglivi, Giorgio, 156
- Bailly, Jean-Sylvain, 160
- Barbot, John, 75, 90, 204n12
- Begriff*: Hegel’s four uses of term, 44–45; and Idea-in-and-for-itself, 53–55
- being: as foundational category, 2; unity with thinking, 18–23
- being-for-self, 189–91
- being-in-transition, 143
- being-soul: as becoming, 143; hylomorphism and, 14, 23–29; and natural spirit, xi, 48–49
- Bendyshe, Thomas, misleading translation of Blumenbach by, 89, 92–93, 95, 205n28
- Bethlehem asylum, London, 174
- Beiträge zur Naturgeschichte* (*Contributions on Natural History*) (Blumenbach), 88–91
- Bichat, Xavier: influence on Hegel, xvi; on life as resistance to death, 50, 62–63
- bipolarism: and coexistence of opposing personalities, xix; contemporary psychiatry on, xix–xx, 166, 169, 170, 171, 175, 193n6; and magnetism, 159–61; and Mesmerism, 5, 160
- Bleuler, Eugen, 166
- Blumenbach, Johann F.: anthropology of, xvii, 88; five-races typology of, 91, 94, 99; influence on Hegel, xvi, xvii, 78; on intermaxillary bone, 180; misleading translation of, 89, 91–93, 205n28; as monogenist, xvii, 88–93, 95, 97, 199n29, 205n30; on mucous membranes, 139; racism ascribed to, 90–91; on vital matter, 49–50
- body: Aristotle on, 25–26, 49–51; connection with mind, 28; disease in, 108–9, 111; distinction from spirit, 29; dominance of spirit over, 149–50, 182–87; as first appearance of spirituality, 188–89; habituation of, 2–3, 120, 180–87; instrumentalization of, 184; living, 25–26, 49–51, 188; and natural will, 4; oneness with soul, 13–14; as referent of concept of soul, xvi–xvii; relation to soul in identity, 24–29; and self-externality, 56–57; and self-feeling, 158–59; self-moving, 51; and sexuality, 124; singular, 24–25; substance becoming, 57–58; sustained by subjectivity, 182; training of, 2, 185–86; transformed by actualized soul, 188–89; uniquely human features of, 180–81; as well-known true thing, 59–60. *See also* body, inorganic
- body, inorganic: conditions for life and, 50; disintegration vs. death in, 132; and externality, 45, 133; indifference of, 56; inner vibration of, 137–39; magnetic properties of, 4
- bourgeois models: of family, 115–17; of individual types, xviii; of sexuality, 124–27
- Breuer, Joseph, on hysteria, 171
- Bruno, Giordano, 34
- Buffon, Georges, 36, 86, 180
- Camper, Peter, 91, 180, 206n33
- Carib peoples, extinction of, 79–80
- cataplexy, as weak-spiritedness, 169–70
- catatonia, contemporary psychiatry on, 166–67

- Catholicism: Inquisition in, 101–2; and monogenism, 85–86; and science, 16
- Caucasian peoples: Hegel's commentaries on, 81–82; religions of, 82–83; soul of, 80
- change, time-dependent patterns of, xviii, 112–27
- character, individual, xviii, 4, 105, 111–12, 176
- Charcot, Jean-Martin, 171
- Charleston Medical Journal*, 94
- Chiarugi, Vincenzo, 154, 212n2
- childhood: acceptance of reality in, 115; ancient and modern perceptions of, 117; and contentment, 116; four mileposts of, 117–18; and self-feeling, 117, 144
- Christianity: asceticism in, 173; and Islam, 74, 82–83
- Cicero, on habit, 178
- circadian cycles: and derangement, 158; as patterns of change, xviii; place in Hegel's theories, xii; today's study of, 5. *See also* waking and sleeping rhythms
- civil society: and age, 116; and asceticism, 149; and character, 111–12; and habit, 187; and sexuality, 124; types in, xviii; weak-spiritedness in, 169
- climate: impact on human species and races, 5, 91; and spirit, xvii; and world-soul, 67–69, 70
- color, theories of, 33, 197n6
- Commentarium in Convivium Platonis De Amore* (Ficino), 123
- concept, the: actuality and, 187–88, 190; of Concept, 28–29, 40; vs. feeling, 156–57; as foundational category, 2; and Idea, 131–32; objectivity and subjectivity of, 32; overgrasping by, 17; and reality, 16
- “Concept, Doctrine of,” 41–43
- connection: of mind and body, 28–29; three kinds of, 53
- conscience, and derangement, 167–68
- consciousness: and being-for-self, 189; and derangement, 159, 172; vs. feeling, 145–46, 153–54; as form of spirit, xvii, 51, 52; as foundational category, 2; vs. gathering impressions, 136–37; and the “I,” 26, 131; and language, 96–97; and madness proper, 165–66; and natural will, 182–83; objective, xix, 159; “opposition of,” 104; psyche as ground of, xi; and psychosomatism, 158; speaking for soul, 69; universality of, xix, 162–63
- corporeity: Descartes and, 22; dominance of spirit over, xx, 12–13, 146, 183; and freedom, 191; and habit, 183–84; and identity, xvi, 24; and illness, 146; represented in sculpture, 188; and sensation, 149; union with spirit in soul, 24
- countenance: as fluorescence of mind, 180; thought detected in, 28
- Crania Americana* (Morton), 94
- carniology/craniometry, 60, 91, 94, 188, 206n33
- creationism, 85–86, 97
- crime: and freedom, 144; and private property, 42–43, 198n21
- Critique of Pure Reason* (Kant), 61–62
- Cullen, William, classifications of derangement, 154
- Cuvier, Georges, 94
- daimōn* term: vs. *genius*, 161, 193n3; and Hamlet, 176; Socrates on, 108
- Darwin, Charles: and Blumenbach, 91, 92; and “descent” term, 93; distorted interpretations of, 96–97; and Haeckel, 210, 210n3; and monogenists, 95, 96, 97
- De anima* (Aristotle): embodiment hypotheses and, 23; *empsychon* in, 130–31; Goethe and, 36–37; Hegel's reliance on, 1; hylomorphic soul in, xiii, xv; matter in, 55; nature in, 11; *noūs* in, 51–52; perceptual organs in, 25–26; *psychē* in, 9; on sleeping and waking, 134–36; soul unmixed with body in, 183; *to sunolon* in, 13–14, 15
- death: as affirming species, 114; life as resistance to, 50, 62–63; necessity of, 31; of organism, 121
- Degeneration* term, 93. *See also* *ausarten/Ausartung* terms

- De Generis* (Blumenbach), 89
- Delle corporee differenze essenziali che passano fra la struttura de' bruti, e la umana* (*On the Essential Bodily Differences between the Structure of Animals and of Human Beings*) (Moscatti), 118–19
- De Methodo* (Descartes), 18–19
- Democritus, on habituation, 177
- De Praxi Medica* (Baglivi), 156
- deportment, human, as “floreescence” of mind, 180–8
- derangement: as coexistence of opposing personalities, xix–xx; and conscience, 167–68; corporal punishment as treatment for, 174; degrees of, xii, 154–55, 165, 168–74; and diremption, 162–64; and double soul, 29, 155; as empirical manifestation of soul, 2, 130–31; and the ethical, 167–68, 172, 175–76; and feelings, 157–58; vs. madness proper, xix; place in Hegel’s theories, xii, 153–57; as psychosomatic, 155–56; and self-feeling, 143–44, 147, 150, 151, 152; as sinking into self, 168; social and historical grounds for, xx, 151–52, 171–76. *See also* folly; insanity; madness, proper; weak-spiritedness
- Descartes, René: *cogito* of, 18–23; and corporeity, 22; and hylomorphism, xv, 17–23; on matter and mind, 59; metaphysics of, 22–23; revolutionary thinking of, 20, 22
- difference: and identity, 134; vs. immanent differentiation, xvi; among individuals, 105–12, 134; sexual, 122–24, 126; of spirit from nature, 181–82; and unity in living thing, 27–28
- Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5), 169–71, 175, 193n6
- diremption: and derangement, 162–64; in healthy mind, 162; and madness proper, 162–65, 168–69, 171–72; and morphology, 33; and sensing, 140–41; of soul’s unity, 6; of spirit-as-soul, 163; of subjective spirit, 189–90
- disorder: derangement as, 144, 153, 159, 165; and disease, 108–9; internal, as result of external, xx, 2, 174–75; and polar self, xviii
- disposition, individual, xviii, 4, 105, 107–8, 176
- divination/clairvoyance: and body, 4; and self-feeling, 151–52
- divine, the: and living body, 49; and *noësis*, 54, 200n45; and soul, 9; as spark, 190
- Dover, J. K., 108
- dreaming: and *Genius*, 161–62, 163; and self-feeling, 150
- dualism: Cartesian, 5, 17–18, 22–23, 193n5; and materialism, 44; and psychosomatism, 156
- eidōs* (form), 14–15, 24, 34, 112, 131
- embodiment: Aristotle on, 23–24; in current theories of mind, 5, 193n4; and laughing, 142; and somatization, 159
- emotions: in individuals, 131; somatization of, 142
- Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences* (Hegel): divisions of, xi–xii; place in Hegel’s works, xiv; place of *Anthropology* in, xii, xiv; publication history of, 7–8. *See also* *Anthropology*; *Philosophy of Nature*; *Philosophy of Spirit*; *Science of Logic*
- Engels, Friedrich, 94
- English people, “local spirit,” of, 102–3
- ensouled, the 131–32, 202n20
- entelechy: of Aristotle, xv, 15, 38, 187–88; in Goethe, 35; in *Science of Logic*, 15, 143; and the teleological, 15, 43–44
- entelechy: and motion, 9, 35; *psuchē* as, 50–51; in soul’s progression toward spirit, 143
- Epicurus, on divine matter, 49, 59
- Essai sur l’inégalité des races humaines* (Gobineau), 94
- “Essay on Maladies of the Head” (Kant), 169
- ethos, local/regional, 104
- ethical, the: and derangement, 167–68, 172, 175–76; and feeling, 148–49,

- 151–52; and free will, 179; and habit, 187; and “local spirits,” 101; and natural disposition, 107–8; and slavery, 76–77
- ethnicities; Hegel’s commentaries on, xvii–xviii, 5, 99; impact of climate and geography on, 5, 91; as “local spirits,” 99–100; and world-soul, 69–70
- Ethnological Society of London, 95
- Euler, Leonhard, 22–23
- European peoples: darkening of, 91; enslavement of Africans by, 75; and extinction of Caribs, 79–80; Hegel’s commentaries on, 70, 83–85, 100–104; and monogenism, 85
- experience: active vs. passive, 136–37; corroboration by logic, 80–81; erotic, 126; vs. feeling, 165–66; internalized, 147
- face, human: as “florescence” of mind, 180–81
- family: bourgeois, as model, xviii, 115–17; and differentiation, xviii; and sexuality, 122–27, 171; and trauma, 171–72; and world-soul, 69–70
- Faust* (Goethe), 36, 98
- feeling: as activity of soul, xi–xii, 142–43, 153–54; vs. concept, 156–57; and consciousness, 145–46; and derangement, xix; endogamous vs. exogamous sources of, 153; erotic, 125–26; ethics based in, 148–49, 151–52; and madness proper, 165–66, 168; and natural will, 182–83; particularity of, xix, 162–63; of selfhood, 1–2, 4; and selfness, 153–54; in sequence with sensibility and sentience, 129; transition from sentience, xviii–xix, 67–68, 130, 133, 142–46
- Ferdinand, King, 102
- fetal life: connection with mother in, 28, 150–51; as empirical manifestation of soul, 130–31; as first milepost of childhood, 117; and *Genius*, 161–62, 163; place in Hegel’s theories, xii; and psychosomatism, xix; and self-feeling, 150; sleep in, 136
- Fetscher, Iring, xii
- Feuerbach, Ludwig, 113
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, xiii, 198n22
- Ficino, Marsilio, 123
- folly: delusion as, 170; mania as, 170; melancholia as, 170–71; and obsessive ideas, 170; as state of soul, 4, 170; suicide as, 171
- Foucault, Michel, on antiesablishment potential of psychopathology, 163–65
- Franklin, Benjamin, 160
- freedom: and art of living, 190–91; and crime, 144; and insight into necessity, 191; made possible by liberation, xx, 187–88; and race, 75, 77–78; as right of humankind, 70; and second nature, xx; of spirit, 80; and state-of-right, 62–63; and virtue, 107
- Freidig (master musician), 90, 206n32
- French people, “local spirit,” of, 102
- French Revolution; and derangement due to terror, 172–73; and psychiatry, 154, 163
- French Royal African Company, 75
- Freud, Sigmund: bourgeois models of, xviii; on hysteria, 171
- Freudianism, on somatization, 142, 211n22
- Fuller, Thomas, 90
- Galen: on habit, 178; humoral doctrine of, xviii, 108–9, 111
- Gannibal, Adam Petrovich, 90
- Gauss, Carl, 111
- Gehrt, Pierre van, 160
- Geist* concept: in first syllogism, 53; and *Genius*, 161; as idealizing activity, 66; and illness of soul, 155, 161; and individual totality, 25; and spirit, xiii–xiv, 8
- Genesis, book of, 85, 87
- Genius* (personality): and derangement, 151–52, 161–62, 163; and *Geist*, 161; of Hamlet, 175; and mind, 28–29
- geography: impact on human species, 5; and national character, 100; and spirit, xvii, 66–67; and world-soul, 67
- geology: in Africa, 80; and distribution of lifeforms, xvii
- Germanic peoples, “local spirit,” of, 100–101, 103–4

- Gesammelte Werk* (Hegel), xiv
gesture, expressing natural will, 180–81
Gobineau, Arthur de, 94
God: Descartes on, 20, 23; in Islam, 82; and mind-body relation, 59; and race, 86
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von: on color, 33, 197n6; on *Hamlet*, 175–76; Heine on, 125; and Idea and, 38–40; on intermaxillary bone, 180; and maternal source of species, 98; on morphology, 33–37; organicism in, xvi; psychobiography of, 33, 196n5; on *Urphänomen*, 33–41
Gould, Stephen Jay: “Eve theory” and, 97–98; on Hegel, 91
Greek peoples, ancient: belief in magic, 71; and concept of genius, 108; four-temperaments doctrine and, 108–9; and habit, 177–78; “local spirit,” of, 100–101, 207n6; non-Hellenic origin of, 79; poetic arts of, 110; sculpture of, 188; sexuality and, 122–27; slavery among, 76
Greene, Murray, xii
Gregorius, Abba, 90
Griesheim, Karl Gustav von, transcripts of Hegel’s oral commentary, 57–58, 110
Grimm brothers, 161
G. W. F. Hegel: *Philosophy of Mind* (Inwood), xiv
habit: Aristotle on, 177, 184; of being human, 188–89; as liberation, 185–87; of life, 115; limits of, 183; as mastery, 187; as term, 178–79; of thinking, 186
habituation: and age, 115; Aristotle on, 177–78, 184; and dominance of spirit, 182–87; and personhood, 186–87; and *poiēsis*, 184–85; as soul taking charge body, 2–3, 120, 146
Haeckel, Ernst, 96, 97, 210n3
Haiti, founding of, 80–81
Hamlet (Shakespeare), madness in, 175–76
Hamann, Johann Georg, 161
hand, human, as “florescence” of mind, 180–81
Hegel, G. W. F.: current views of, 6, 194n11; medical and psychological theories of, xii, 4–5; ; racism and, 17, 77; sources of, 5; system of philosophy, xi–xiii, xv, 1–9, 42–43, 48–49, 53, 190–91, 194n11 theory of history, 72–78; works and translations of, xiv, 3–4, 7–8
Hegel’s Philosophy of Mind (Miller), xiv
Hegel’s Philosophy of Nature (Miller), xiv
Hegel’s Philosophy of Nature (Petry) xiv
Hegel’s Philosophy of Subjective Spirit (Petry) xiv, 5
Heine, Heinrich, 125
Heraclitus, on divine spark, 190
Herder, Johann Gottfried, 161
Herodotus, 71, 101
heterosexuality, 122–24, 126–27
Hindu peoples, “local spirit,” of, 100
Hinduism, asceticism in, 173
Hippocrates: definition of hysteria, 158; humoral doctrine of, xviii, 108–9, 111
Histoire de la folie (Foucault), 164
Histories (Herodotus), 101
history: of anthropology, 94, 95; legal, 42; moral, 84; of philosophy, xiii, 20–21, 65, 77, 121; philosophy of, 77–78; of psychiatry, 154–55, 164; and the right, 16–17, 75; and sexuality, 126; spirit’s self-objectification in, 55–56; as term, 99–100, *See also* natural history
History of Modern Belles Lettres in Germany (Heine), 125
Hobbes, Thomas: on state of nature, 76; and state-of-right, 62
Hölderlin, Friedrich, 33
Home, Henry: as polygenist, 86–87, 95–96, 205n26; theory on race, 78
Homo sapiens, separation from *Homo erectus*, 97–98
homosexuality, 121–24, 126–27, 209n29
Hösle, Vittorio, 123
Hotze, Henry, 94
hulē (matter), 14–16, 24, 131
humanity, in transition from *anthropos* to *Mensch*, 179, 182
Hunt, James: as antiabolitionist, xvii; as polygenist, 95–96; theory on race, 78

- hylomorphism: in *Anthropology*, xv, 6–7; Aristotle on, xiii, 14–17, 199n2; and being-soul, 23–29; Descartes and, 17–23; and derangement, 174; expanded notion of, 49; matter and form in, 14–16, 22–23, 49–52; Plato on, xvi; and sentience xix, 142; and sexuality, 123; subjectivity vs. objects in, 5; as term, 14–16; and world-soul, 69
- hypnosis: and animal magnetism, 4, 160, 165; as empirical manifestation of soul, 130–31; and internal rift, 146; place in Hegel's theories, xii; and psychosomatism, xix; and self-feeling, 150. *See also* Mesmerism
- hysteria: collective, as empirical manifestation of soul, 130–31; Freud on, 171; Hippocratic definition of, 158
- “I,” the: and actual soul, 188–89; and awakening, 162; consciousness and, 26, 131, 136; Descartes and, 22–23; Fichte and, xiii; and habit, 183–84; self-feeling as precursor to, xix; viewing itself in its other, 190–91
- Idea, the: Goethe and, 38–41; hylomorphism as corollary of, 16–17; Idea-in-and-for-itself, 52–55; and phenomena of live matter, 143; in philosophy of the real, 130; and spirit's emergence from nature, xvi, 46–48, 181–82; as union of objectivity with its concept, 131–32
- idealism: and forms of spirit, xvii; Goethe and, 38; Hegel and, 6, 58; and mind-body problem, 65–66
- idealism of youth, 115–16
- identity: and difference, 134; internally differentiated, xvi, 26; judgement on, 41–42; racial, 81–82; and relation of soul and body, 24–29
- identity-in-difference: and awakening, 162–63; and habituation, 183–84
- illness: and cosmic effects, 70–71; humoral doctrine of, xviii, 108–9, 111; mental, *see* derangement; psychosomatic, 131, 151; as rift between corporeal and immaterial, 146
- immateriality: and being-soul, 48–49, 51; as core of matter, 55–58; of material nature, 49–51, 64, 129, 130, 137, 181; and soul, xvi, 3, 6, 22–23, 146; of spirit, 64; unity with materiality, 24–25
- individual: and derangement, 165–66; dynamic oneness of, 25; emotions and, 131; habituation of, 183–84, 187; maintaining sameness, 13; as political animal, 187; psychic birth of, 146–47; selfness in, 145, 147–48; symbiosis of spirituality and materiality in, 142; as thinking subject, 157; threefold classification of, 105–12. *See also* character, individual; disposition, individual; temperament, individual
- individuality: and hylomorphism, xv, 142; and illness, 71; organic, 31–32; path to consciousness of, 150; physiospiritual aspects of, 104–5, 142; self-preserving, 138; and thinking, 19; time-dependent changes in, 112–27
- infinity, “untrue,” 105
- Inquisition, Spanish, 101–2
- insanity: epidemics of, 162; and feeling, xix, 153–54; living with, 164–65; and psychosomatism, xix; and reason, 174; and trauma, 162–63. *See also* derangement; madness, proper
- Inwood, Michael, xiv, 200n39
- irritability: as basic activity of organism, xix, 13, 138–42; as reaction to sensation, 137–40, 144; and soul, 2, 58
- Islam: “abstractions” in, 173; and Christianity, 74, 82–83
- Italian Journal* (Goethe), 36
- Italian people, “local spirit,” of, 101
- Janet, Pierre, 171
- Jewish peoples: as descendents of Adam and Eve, 86; Home on, 86, 205n26; oppression of, 93
- judgement (*Urteil*): and being-for-self, 189; and Concept, 41–43; Kant on, 61–62, 201n5; and madness proper, 165–66; meanings of, xvi; and nature-spirit relationship, 32–33, 34, 43–44; as term, 33, 41

- Julius II, Pope, 85
 Juncker, Thomas, 91
- Kant, Immanuel: anthropology of, xvii, 91; and *Ausartung* term, 92–93; and being-soul, 24; and *daimōn*, 108; on Descartes, 19; influence of Aristotle and Plato on, 34; on “maladies of the head,” xx, 154, 165, 172, 173–74, 193n1, 211n20; on negative infinite judgments, 61–62, 201n5; on pseudopolitics, 167; on race, 84–85; on thing-in-itself, 132, 198n22; on upright posture, 118–19; on weak-spiritedness, 169
- Kehler, Friedrich, transcripts of Hegel’s oral commentary, 57–58, 64–65
- kinship: and age, 112–18; and character, 111–12
- Kluge, Karl A., 160
- Lamarck, Jean-Baptiste: anthropology of, xvii, 96; Blumenbach and, 91; as monogenist, 94; theory of life, 73
- La Mettrie, Julien Offroy de, 60, 64
- Lavoisier, Antoine, 160
- law: vs. conscience, 167–68; vs. feeling, 148–49; freedom to violate, 62–63; mechanical and chemical, 45; and movement, 43–44; and state-of-right, 26–27
- Laws of Manu*, 100
- Lectures on Aesthetics* (Hegel): Greek sculpture in, 188; Hamlet’s madness in, 174–76; light in, 63; place in Hegel’s works, xiv
- Lectures on the History of Philosophy* (Hegel): Descartes in, 17–18; place in Hegel’s works, xiv
- Lectures on the Philosophy of History* (Hegel): Aristotle in, 25–26; Descartes in, 21; Greek peoples in, 79; infamous passage on Africa in, 72; place in Hegel’s works, xiv; slavery in, 76
- Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm: on difference, 106; influence of Aristotle and Plato on, 34; on matter, 59, 201n52; on monad, 3, 136, 149, 210n5; on sensation, 147
- liberation: and habit, 183–84; making freedom possible, xx, 187–88; and second nature, xx, 180
- life: animal, 1; cosmic influences on, 70–72; development into spirit, xi–xii; habit of, 115; implicit in non-living nature, 132; and organic individuality, 31–32; potential for, 50; and self-division of cell, 43; and self-externality, 56–58; and self-induced motion, 66; tedium in, 170–71; transition from sensibility to sentience, 130
- light: consciousness as source of, 150; divine, xvi; nineteenth-century theories of, 64–65; in Zoroastrianism, 63
- Linnaeus, Carl, 35, 86, 91, 201n52
- Lislet, Geoffroy, 90
- “local spirits,” of world cultures, 100–101
- logic: corroboration of experience by, 80–81; Hegel’s principles of, 7–8 and metaphysics, 42; of One and Many, 60–63; science of, 42–43; of singularity, 106
- Louis XVI, King, 160
- Lucinde* (Schlegel), 125
- madness, proper: as coexistence of irreconcilable realities, 165–67; and diremption, 162–65, 168–69, 171–72; and doubleness, 165–68; Foucault on, 163–64; vs. generic derangement, xix, 165; of Hamlet, 175–76; and reason, 164, 173–74; and self-alienation, 171; and self-feeling, 143–44; social and historical grounds for, 171–76; as state of soul, 4, 169, 176. *See also* derangement; insanity
- magic: and self-feeling, 150; as unmediated efficacy, 162; and world-soul, 71–72
- magic relation, 162
- magnetism: and hypnosis, 160, 165; Mesmer on, 160
- Malebranche, Nicolas, 59
- Manning, Gideon, 15
- Martineau, James, 16

- Marx, Karl: on German states, 103, 207n9; on money, 103, 210n8; and slavery, 95, 96
- materiality: concept of, 55–56; symbiosis with spirituality, 142; unity with immateriality, 24–25
- matter: and being-soul, 48; immateriality as core of, 55–58; living, 52, 127; and spirit, 63–66, 142; “vital,” 49–50
- Meditations* (Descartes), 18–19
- “Memoir on Madness” (Pinel), 154, 164, 174
- Mesmer, Franz, 5, 159–60
- Mesmerism: and bipolarism, 5; and vulnerability of soul, 159–60. *See also* hypnosis
- metaphysics: Aristotelian, 9, 13–14, 24–28, 54–55, 200n45; and actuality, xiii; Cartesian, 20–23; of difference, 106; in Hegel’s system, xv, 194n11; of joint materiality and immateriality of nature, 44–58, 129; of mental faculties, 11–12; of sentient natural bodies, 132–33; speculative logic and, 42; of spirit’s emergence from nature, 181–82; of substance, 13–14; Thomistic, 16; of waking and sleeping, 135–36
- Metaphysics* (Aristotle): animal in, 9; matter in, 55; *noësis* in, 54, 200n45; substance in, 13–14
- Miller, A. V., xiv
- mind: diremption of, 162–64; dualism and, 5; healthy, 162; and hyloplomorphic soul, xiii; nervous system and, 28–29; physiological basis of, 4; reflective, 66; as unknown thing, 59–60
- mind-body: connection in, 28–29; contemporary theories of, 5; and “florescence” of features, 180–81; identity of 59; interactionism of, xvi, 59–62; and sentience, 131; unity of, 63–64
- monad: dormant and active, 3; immaterial, 60; of monads, 149; sensation and, 136, 210n5
- Mongol peoples, Hegel’s commentaries on, 70, 81, 204n17
- monogenism: Blumenbach on, xvii, 88–93, 199n29; Catholic Church on, 85–86; in debates on slavery, 83–85, 87–88; Kant and, 85; Lamarck and, 93–94; origins of concept, 85–88; and race, 95–98
- Montesquieu: on climates, 75; and French “local spirit,” 102; and race, 80
- Morgan, Lewis Henry, 94
- Morton, Samuel G.: as antiabolitionist, xvii; as polygenist, 94–95; theory on race, 78
- Moscatti, Pietro 118–19
- motion: nervous system in, 28; of organism, 35, 43, 138; self-induced, 9, 43, 51, 66, 138–39; of solar system, 26–27; universal, 144–45
- Mowad, Nicholas, xii
- national character/features: Hegel commentaries on, 100–104; and world-soul, 69–70
- Native American peoples: as descendents of Adam and Eve, 85; and tectonic movements, 79
- natural history: differentiation of races in, 73–78, 88–89; “history” term and, 99–100; of humanity, 180; spiritual 186–87; and world-soul, 68–72
- Naturalis historia* (Pliny the Elder), 99
- nature: animal, 9; and Concept, 41–43, 47–48; emergence of spirit from, xvi, 11–14, 16–17, 43–48, 180–82, 190–91; Goethe on, 37–40; in Hegel’s system of logic of, 7–8; ideality of, 48–49; and individual capacities, 107–8; joint materiality and immateriality of, 44–58, 129; and judgement, 32–33; living vs. nonliving, xi, 43–44, 132; vs. natural spirit, 6; in philosophy of the real, 130; self-sublation of, xii–xiii, xviii–xix, 27–28, 45–48, 57–58, 63, 130–31, 190, 195n4; and sentience, 67–68; as term, 43. *See also* nature, first; nature, second
- nature, first: Greeks on, 177–78; habit as liberation from, 187–88; and will, xx

- nature, second: attained through habituation, 187–88; being-for-self as, 188; Greeks on, 177–78; in modern philosophy, 178; and natural will, xx, 179–80; as object of will, 188–89; and sexuality, 127; and upright posture, 119–20
- necessity: biological, 126; insight into, 191; logical, 5, 80, 105, 144, 207n11, 208n11; physical, 184; syllogism of, 53–54
- Neoplatonism, 190, 200n42
- Newton, Isaac, 33, 40, 41, 201n52
- noēsis* (speculative thinking), 54, 200n45
- Nott, Josiah, 94
- noūs* (intellect), 51–52, 186, 199n35
- Nuzzo, Angelica, xii, 200n37
- objectivity: and being-for-self, 189; of Concept, 32; and derangement, 159; and madness proper, 165–66; in “opposition of consciousness,” 104; subjective categories of, 41
- Occasionalists, the, 23
- One and Many, logic of, 60–63
- “On Habit” (Galen), 178
- “On the Different Races of Human Beings” (Kant), 84–85
- opposites: distinction of, xvi; unification of, 6–7
- organicity: crossover to subjectivity, 8–9; in nonmechanical systems, xvi; and self-external bodies, 56–58
- organism: Aristotle on, 35; death of, 121; as individual, 8; and the inorganic, 43, 198n22; irritability in, xix, 137; morphology of, 38–41; motion of, 35; physicality and immateriality of, xx, 23–25, 196n23; and the real, 28, 43; sensibility of, xix; simple, 8; sleeping and waking of, 127; three basic activities of, 138–42
- original division (*Ur-teilung*), meanings of, xvi
- Origin of Species* (Darwin), 96–97
- orthogenesis, 97, 206n42
- Outlines of the Philosophy of Right* (Hegel): age in, 116; feeling-based ethics in, 148–49; free will in, 119, 179, 191; habit in, 186–87; Idea in, 16–17; market system in, 103; place in Hegel’s works, xiv; Platonic love in, 123–24; public vs. private agency in, 167–68; slavery in, 76; state-of-right in, 62, 62–63; world history in, 79
- Parmenides* (Plato), xvi, 45, 60–60, 202n12
- Parts of Animals* (Aristotle), 50–51
- passive vs. active states: in sexuality, 124; and transition from sensibility to sentience, 130, 137, 140–41
- peoples. *See* ethnicity
- “Perpetual Peace” (Kant), 167
- personhood: and anthropology, 104; and habituation, 186–87; and race, 74, 84; and self-reflective thought, 98; and slavery, 75; and subjection, 84
- Pesch, Tilmann, 16
- Petry, Michael Jon, translations of Hegel by, xiv, 5, 45–46, 111, 114, 162, 170, 202n10, 202n12, 203n2, 212n1
- Peyrère, Isaac de la: as polygenist, 85–86; theory on race, 78
- Phaedrus* (Plato), 109
- phenomena, archetypal (*Urphänomen*), 33–41
- Phenomenology of Spirit* (Hegel): Inwood translation of, xiv; knowing in, 20; place in Hegel’s works, xiv, 7; prevalent readings of, xi, 6; reality of spirit in, 60; self-alienated spirit in, 148; and three syllogisms, 53
- Philosophie biologique* (Lamarck), 94
- Philosophy of Nature* (Hegel): feeling of deficiency in, 119; Idea in, 12, 40–41; organism in, 43; phenomena of live matter in, 143; place in Hegel’s works, 8; sentience in 131–32, 134; sexuality in, 120–21, 123; and three syllogisms, 53; transition from nature to spirit in, 46; universality in, 190; universal mechanics in, 70–71
- Philosophy of Spirit* (Hegel): full-fledged forms of spirit in, xi; idealism in, 65–66; nature in, 12; transition from nature to spirit in, 46
- Philosophy of Subjective Spirit* (Hegel): argument pattern in, 2; Aristotle in,

- 54–55; and habituation and, 178;
idealism in, 66–67; psychology in, 11–
12; self-knowing reason in, 52
physicality: of Idea, 47–48; idealizing of,
146; and self-externality, 56–58; and
spirit, 141–42
phusis (nature): and disposition, 108;
and habituation, 177, 178
Physics (Aristotle): matter in, 55
Pinel, Philippe, psychiatric studies of,
xx, 151, 154, 211n27, 212n2; on
reason and madness proper, 173–74;
on self-alienation, 163–65; on social
and historical causes of derangement,
171, 172
Pinkard, Terry, xii
plant: vs. animal, 136, 138–39, 208n20;
archetypal, 34–36, 40; daily and
seasonal patterns of, 136
Plato: on consciousness, 150; on
divination, 152; embodiment
hypotheses and, 23; on first nature,
177–78; on four temperaments, 109;
Goethe and, 33–34, 38, 39, 197n16;
on morphology, 33; on One and
Many, xvi, 45, 60–62; on sexuality,
121–25, 127
Platonism, Goethe and, 33–34. *See also*
Neoplatonism
Pliny the Elder, 99
poiësis (action in view of a product)
vs. *praxis* (action for its own sake),
184–85
political, the: despotism in, 168, 173;
individual and, 187
polygenism: Anthropological Society
of London and, 95–96; Darwin and,
96–97; in debates on slavery, 83–85,
87–88, 95–96; as heretical doctrine,
85; history of concept, 85–88; Hunt
and, 95–96; Morton and, 94–95;
racist proponents of, 94–98
Prae-Adamitae (Peyrère), 85
Principia (Descartes), 21–22
psuchê (psyche): Aristotle on, 3, 14–17,
49–51, 196n21; capacity to become
noûs (intellect), 51–52; as ground of
consciousness, xi; and matter, 49; and
potential to become alive, 50; and
self-moving body, 51
psychiatry, contemporary: and
Additions, 4–5; classification of
disorders by, xix–xx, 166–71, 175;
and Foucault, 163–65; and Mesmer,
160; on trauma, 171–72, 213n20
psychology: developmental, 113;
empirical, 11–12; and humoral
doctrines, xviii, 110–11, 208n15
psychosomatism: and consciousness,
158; and hylomorphic soul, xix;
place in Hegel's theories, xii; and self-
feeling, 150; as term, 156
Pushkin, Alexander, 90
Quakers, as asylum reformers, 174
races, human: Blumenbach on, 88–
89, 91–92, 97; as differentiation of
world-soul, 68–72; eighteenth- and
nineteenth-century science on, 73–74,
77–78, 83–85, 95–96, 205n21; and
freedom, 75, 77–78, 84; geography in
differentiation of, 80, 81, 84; history
of concept, xvii, 73–74, 77–78, 83–
85; monogenist vs. polygenist debates
and, 83–98; in theory of history,
72–78
racism: ascribed to Blumenbach, 90–
91; Hegel's written comments vs.
personal views construed as, 17, 77;
as term, 17, 204n8; universalism vs.
particularism and, 94–95, 97
reality: comprehensive theory of, 7–8;
concept and, 16; and derangement,
165–66, 176; philosophy of, xi, xv,
xvi, 2, 28–29, 43, 130
reason: and divine spark, 190; and free
will, 167–68; and madness proper,
164, 173–74; as stage of spirit, 52
religion: “abstractions” in, 173; African,
74, 80, 204n11; monotheistic, 82–83;
representation of spirit in, 64–65; and
self-understanding, 82
Republic (Plato), 109
revolution: and psychiatry, 164–65; and
trauma, xix, xx, 2. *See also* French
Revolution
right: Idea of, 16–17; and political
despotism, 168, 173; sphere of, 26–
27. *See also* state-of-right

- rights, human, 164
- Roman people, ancient: belief in magic, 71; and habit, 177–78; “local spirit,” of, 100–101; slavery among, 76
- Roman Holy See, 102
- Romantics, the: and the erotic, 125; on feeling, 151–52; on talent and genius, xviii, 107–8, 110
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques: anthropology of, xvi, 88; on climate, 75; and habituation, 179; on humans as animals, 2; and liberation, 184; on mental disorder, 169, 193n1; and state-of-right, 62
- Schelling, Friederich, 34, 107
- Schelling, Karl, 160
- Schiller, Friedrich, 37
- schizophrenia: and coexistence of opposing personalities, xix, 167–69; contemporary psychiatry on, xix–xx, 166–67, 169; political, 168; as term, 166, 169
- Schlegel, Friedrich von, 125
- Schleicher, August, 96–97
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 15–16
- Schneider, Helmut, 162
- science: and astrology, 159; and Catholicism, 16; cosmology as, 72; Goethe and, 33, 38, 197n6; and naturalness of soul, 69; of subjectivity, 5
- Science of Logic* (Hegel): actuality in, xi, 187–88; Concept in, 40, 42–43; dialectic of essence and appearance in, 27–28; entelechism in, 15, 143; experience in, 80–81; foundational categories in, 2; and Idea-in-and-for-itself, 52–55; individuality in, 13; infinite judgment in, 61–62; inner vibration of bodies in, 137–38; phenomena of live matter in, 143; place in Hegel’s works, xiv–xv, 7; publication history of, 7; self-opposition in, 46–47; singularity in, 106; and three syllogisms, 53; thinking in, 20–21; unity of matter and spirit in, 60
- scientific and medical theories, eighteenth-century: Mesmerism in, 159–60; of psychiatry, 154, 163–65, 174; of race, 83–85, 205n21
- scientific and medical theories, nineteenth-century: of anthropology, 78, 87, 94–96, 119; of biology, 33–37, 130, 142; on light and gravitation, xvi, 33, 64–65; of physics, 41; of psychology, xviii, 4; of psychiatry, 4–5, 154–76; on race, 73–74, 77–78, 83–85, 95–96
- seeing: Aristotle on, 25–26; as ocular and mental skill, 186
- self-consciousness: as dimension of spirit, xi, xvii, 52; and habituation, 184; and mental disease/derangement, 150, 159
- self-externality: and inorganic bodies, 132–33; and physicality, 56–58
- self-feeling: in childhood, 117, 144; and clairvoyance, 151–52; and derangement, 143–44, 147, 150, 151–52, 158–59; healthy, 163; as precursor to “I,” xix; as presentiment of selfhood, 8, 117; as primitive, xviii; and sentience, 67–68; of soul, 142–43
- selfhood: Descartes on, 21; losing of, 4; and madness proper, 162, 166, 168–69; preconscious feeling of as selfness, 1–2; presentiment of as self-feeling, 8
- selfness (*Selbstischkeit*): and awakening, 162; and feeling, 153–54, 159; and *Genius*, 161; in individual, 145, 147–48; and madness proper, 162, 165–66, 168–69; as preconscious feeling of selfhood, 1–2; shared between fetus and mother, 150–51; unification with body in actual soul, 188
- self-opposition: in individual, xviii, 104–5, 113–14; in natural systems, 46–47; in sexuality, 121–22
- self-replication as basic activity of organism, 138–42
- self-sublation: of nature, xii–xiii, xviii–xix, 27–28, 45–48, 57–58, 63, 130–31, 190, 195n4; and sentience, xviii–xix, 130–31, 141–42
- sensation: and derangement, 159; and feeling soul, 146–48; singularity of, 159

- sensibility: as basic activity of organism, 138–42; vs. irritability, 137; in sequence with sentience and feeling, 129; transition to sentience, 130, 140
- sensing: as activity of soul, 3, 140–41; of sensing, 136–37; singularity of, xix
- sentience: as activity of soul, xi–xii, 141–42; conversion to preconscious awareness, 153–54; as detecting of sensations, 133–34, 136–37; and feeling soul, 163; as finding of affections in the body, 67–68; vs. grasping, 156; and irritability, 140; and mind-body, 131; of natural bodies, 132–33; and self-sublation, xviii–xix, 130–31; in sequence with sensibility and feeling, 129; and sleep-waking cycle, 133–36; transition from sensibility, 130, 140; transition to feeling, 142–46
- sexuality: as activity vs. attribute, 126; current views on, 4; as pattern of change, xviii, 112, 120–27; Plato on, 121–25, 127, 209n29; and soul, 2, 121–22; and species, 120–21; as term, 123; and trauma, 171–72. *See also* heterosexuality, homosexuality
- Shakespeare, William, 103, 175
- singularity: destruction by universality, 190; logic of, 106
- Sixtus IV, Pope, 102
- Sketches on the History of Man* (Home), 86
- skill, psychophysical: Aristotle on, 185; and body, 2, 184–85; and dominance of spirit, xx, 183; and habit, 183–84; place in Hegel's theories, xii, 181; and subjectivity, 182–83; types of, xx, 186
- slavery: and African peoples, 75, 90, 204n12; and British market system, 103; European justification for, 83–84; and instrumentalization of body, 184; monogenist vs. polygenist debates and, 83–85, 87, 89–90, 95–96, 205n23
- Smith, Adam, 86–87
- Social Contract* (Rousseau), 62
- Socrates: on *daimōn*, 108; and Plato, 124
- somatization: of emotion, 142; and identity-relation of soul to body, 25
- somnambulism, and derangement, 165, 166
- Sophie Charlotte, Queen, 106
- soul (*Seele*): actual, 1–2, 182, 183, 187–89; anthropological, 104–5; as concept of body, xvi–xvii; corporeal condition of, 55–58; and derangement, 162–72, 176; Descartes and, 22–23; differentiation of, 68–69, 124–25; diremption and, 6, 33, 141, 163, 189; “double,” 29, 130, 155; empirical manifestations of, 130–31; foundational categories and, 2; and God, 23; healthy vs. diseased, 153–57; historical upheavals and, 172–76; and ideality of nature, 48–49; joint material and immaterial status, 5–6, 22, 49–52; as limited form of spirit, xiii, 52; machine, 60; maladies of, 145–46; natural, 8; and nature, 28–29, 44, 129; oneness with body 13–14; physicality of, 12–13, 25; place in Hegel's theories, xii, 2–9; relation to body in identity, 24–29; self-diremption of, 169; and self-moving body, 51; sentient, 141–42; and sexuality, 2, 121–22, 124–25; and skill acquisition, 185–86; as term, 9, 202n10; terrestrial features of, xvii; transition to spirit, xiii–xiv, 182–84, 188–89; as unity of body and spirit, 23–24, 63–64, 181; unmixed with body, 183; in Western philosophy, xv, 1–3; as world-soul, 67–72. *See also* soul, feeling; spirit, natural
- soul, feeling: and derangement, xix, 153–58; and folly, 170; as inward seeing, 151–52; vs. self-feeling, 142–43; and sensation, 146–48; sublated, 144–46; subsisting between sentience and consciousness, 163
- Spanish people, “local spirit,” of, 101–2
- species, human: and archetypal phenomena, 40; Darwin and, 96–97; fertility-criterion for, 86; as genus, 113–14; and habit, 179, 180, 184; historical-developmental character of, 76–77; history of concept, xvii;

- species, human (*continued*)
 impact of climate and geography on, 5, 70, 74–75; in monogest/polygenist beliefs on race, 85–98; orthogenesis and, 97; and sexuality, 120–21; soul of, 73; and upright posture, 118–20; and world-soul, 69–70, 71
- Spinoza, Baruch, 16, 34, 44, 59
- spirit: actualizations of, xi; and body, 129, 149–50, 182–89; and Concept, 32, 190; corporeity of, 58; diremption and, 163; emergence from nature, xvi, 11–14, 16–17, 43–48, 180–82, 190–91; forms of, xvii, 12–13, 26, 48–49, 58; and habit, 183–87; in Hegel's system of logic of, 7–8; and language, 188; local, 100–104; and matter, 55–56, 63–66; “moving from concept to actuality,” 44–45; as nature's implicit truth, 44–46; and “opposition of consciousness,” 104; in philosophy of the real, 130; and physicality, 141–42; self-alienated, 148; singular-universal, 190–91; and thinking, 23; transition from soul, xiii–xiv, 182–84, 188–89; union with corporeity in soul, 23–24, 63–64, 181. *See also* spirit, absolute; spirit, natural; spirit, subjective
- spirit, absolute: in philosophy of soul, 6; self-knowing of, 67
- spirit, natural: in *Anthropology*, xi, 1–2; and being-as-soul, xi; development into full-fledged spirit, 52–53; and feeling vs. self-feeling soul, 142–43; freedom of, 191; materiality and immateriality in, 49–51; in philosophy of soul, 6, 48–55; plurality of in world-soul, 78–79; and second nature, 178; and subjective spirit, xx. *See also* soul
- spirit, objective: ethical life of, 66–67; in philosophy of soul, 6; and spirit-as-soul, xi–xii; and sphere of right, 26–27
- spirit, subjective: and higher awakening, 189; intelligent mind of, 66–67; journey from natural soul to, xx, 180–81, 189–91; and logic of One and Many, 60–63; stages of, 51–52
- state-of-right: and freedom, 62–63; and law, 26–27
- Stederoth, Dirk, xii
- Stoicism: on divine spark, 190; on liberation and freedom, xx, 191
- Stoics, the: on art of life, 177–78; division of logic, physics, and ethics, 7; on self-reflective thinking, 18; on suicide, 151
- Studies on Hysteria* (Breuer and Freud), 171
- subjectivity: categories of, 41–42, 182; of Concept, 32; crossover from organicity, 8–9; and derangement, xix, 156–57; emerging, 69; as essence of spirit, 189–90; in “opposition of consciousness,” 104; and political despotism, 168, 173; rational, 163; science of, 5; and sexuality, 124; substance becoming, 57–58; sustaining body, 182
- sublation: of exteriority, 132; and feeling, 142; of feeling selfness, 189; first, 190–91; of natural will, 182–83; nature overcoming itself in, 12, 45, 47; as term, 194n2; of thought, 19. *See also* self-sublation
- sylogisms, of being, reflection, and necessity, 52–55
- Symposium* (Plato), 121–22, 127, 209n29
- Systema Naturae* (Linnaeus), 35
- technē* (craft or art) of life, 177–78, 184–85, 190–91
- teleological, the: in Aristotle, 15, 197n8; as entelechism, 15, 43–44
- teleology: of attainment of freedom, 84; of living nature, 27, 43–44; as subjective category of objectivity, 41
- telos: continuation of species as, 122, 125; and enslavement, 75; happiness as, 164; of moral agents, xx
- temperament, individual, xviii, 4, 105, 108–11, 176
- terror, derangement due to, 172–73
- Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Smith), 87
- thinking: and derangement, 156–57; habit of, 186; physiological conditions for, xx; and the real, 28; speculative,

- 54; spirit in, 23; unity with being, 18–23; universality of, 159, 195n14
- Thomistic thought, 16
- Timaeus* (Plato), 23, 152, 202n20
- to sunolon* (unity), 13–14, 15, 130–31, 195n6
- trauma: and family, 171–72; and insanity, 162–63; psychiatry on, 171–72; and revolutionary/historical events, xix, xx, 2, 171–73, 213n20
- Treviranus, Gottfried R.: theory of life, 73
- true, the, 132
- truth: and existence, 129; of nature, 44–46; spirit as, 189; vs. the true, 132
- unity: Aristotle on, 13–14, 15, 130–31; “concrete,” 13, 15; and Descartes, 17–23; in family, 126; living, 6–7; of living thing, 27–28; of materiality and ideality, 130–31; of matter and spirit, 60, 181; of nature and spirit, xvii, 63–64, 66; self-differentiating, xvi
- universality: and destruction of singularity, 190; vs. commonality, 41–42; of consciousness, xix, 162–63; of thought, 159, 195n14
- upright/erect posture: due to dominance of spirit, xx; Kant on, 118–19; and natural will, 4, 119–20, 181, 186–87; and self-conditioning, 2–3, 185–86
- Urteil und Seyn* (Hölderlin), 33
- Voltaire, 102
- waking and sleeping rhythms, xix, 4, 127, 133–36, 141, 162
- Wallace, William, 45
- weak-spiritedness/mental weakness: absent-mindedness as, 169; belief in magic as, 70–71; catalepsy as, 169–70; and derangement, 168–69, 174; “imbecility” as, 169; Kant on, 169; rambling as, 169; as state of soul, 4; superstition and, 71
- Wealth of Nations* (Smith), 87
- Werke in zwanzig Bänden* (Hegel), xiv
- West Indian peoples, Hegel’s commentaries on, 70
- White, Charles, 95
- will: as dimension of spirit, xi, xvii, 51, 52; world shaped according to, 190–91
- will, free: and attainment of personhood, 186–87; vs. natural will, 119, 167–68, 179; and reason, 167–68
- will, natural: as condition for second nature, xx, 179–80; effect on body, 4, 182–83; vs. free will, 119, 167–68, 186; sublation of, 182–83; and upright posture, 4, 119–20, 181, 186
- Winfield, Richard, xii
- world: ethical disorder of, 175–76; objective, xix, 172; of one’s own making, xx, 190–91
- world-soul: geographical distribution of, 67–72; natural spirit in, 78–79; and self-opposition, 113–14
- Young Hegelians, 99, 115, 210n8
- Zoroastrianism, xvi, 63